

Vol. XXVII.

JULY, 1950.

No. 3.

THE AUSTRALASIAN
Catholic Record

FOR CLERGY
AND RELIGIOUS



*The Official Organ for communications issued by the
Apostolic Delegate to Australasia.*

Announcements

MSS., queries and books for review, should be addressed to the Editor, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

Queries relating to S. Scripture, Moral Theology, Canon Law, Liturgy, or any subject of professional interest, are cordially invited. Name and address, even if not intended for publication, must accompany all Queries.

Notice of change of address, and correspondence about missing and back numbers, should be addressed to the Manager, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: *Yearly, in advance, 15/-.*

Remittances should be sent to the Manager or the Diocesan Collector, either by postal order or cheque.

The clergy of each diocese are invited to appoint one of their number to collect and forward their annual subscriptions.

The following priests are acting as collectors and representatives for the *Australasian Catholic Record* in their respective dioceses:—

Archdiocese of Sydney—A.C.R. Staff.

Archdiocese of Perth—Rt. Rev. J. T. McMahon, M.A., Ph.D., South Perth, W.A.

Archdiocese of Wellington—Rev. J. L. Dunn, Wellington, N.Z.

Archdiocese of Adelaide—Rev. D. O'Connell, Murray Bridge, S.A.

Archdiocese of Brisbane—Rev. V. Carroll, Banyo, Q.

Archdiocese of Hobart—Rev. J. Wallis, Launceston, Tas.

Archdiocese of Canberra and Goulburn—Rev. J. Blakeney, P.P., Cobargo, N.S.W.

Diocese of Armidale—Rev. J. Healy, Armidale, N.S.W.

Diocese of Auckland—Rt. Rev. L. Buxton, D.C.L., M.A., Hamilton, N.Z.

Diocese of Ballarat—V. Rev. E. Glowrey, St. Arnaud, Vic.

Diocese of Bathurst—V. Rev. M. J. Dunne, B.A., Adm. Bathurst, N.S.W.

Diocese of Cairns—Rev. E. C. Clifford, O.S.A., Tully, Q.

Diocese of Christchurch—V. Rev. T. Liddy, Adm., Christchurch, N.Z.

Diocese of Darwin—Rev. W. Henschke, M.S.C., Darwin, N.T.

Diocese of Dunedin—Rev. A. Loughnan, Dunedin, N.Z.

Diocese of Geraldton—Rev. Bryan Gallagher, Ph.D., Three Springs, W.A.

Diocese of Lismore—V. Rev. T. Morris, P.P., Smithtown, N.S.W.

Diocese of Maitland—Rev. T. Cronin, Waratah, N.S.W.

Diocese of Port Augusta—Very Rev. W. P. Kain, Pekina, S.A.

Diocese of Rockhampton—V. Rev. P. J. Walsh, D.D., Adm., Rockhampton, Q.

Diocese of Sale—V. Rev. J. Fitzpatrick, Leongatha, Vic.

Diocese of Sandhurst—Rev. J. Hussey, Bright, Vic.

Diocese of Toowoomba—Rev. M. Mahon, Adm., Warwick, Q.

Diocese of Townsville—Very Rev. K. J. H. Kelly, D.D., Ayr, Q.

Diocese of Wagga—V. Rev. J. Larkins, P.P., Junee, N.S.W.

Diocese of Wilcannia-Forbes—Very Rev. Dean J. Sexton, V.F., Nyngan, N.S.W.

Editor:

V. Rev. Mgr. T. VEECH.

Manager: REV. F. A. MECHAM,
St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

The Australasian Catholic Record

A Quarterly Publication under Ecclesiastical Sanction

"Pro Ecclesia Dei." St. Augustine.

Contents:

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS,

- Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S. 191
- Names of Servants of God beatified and canonized during the first half of 1950—Instruction of S.C. of the Holy Office on "The Oecumenical Movement"—Proscription of book—Decree of S.C. of the Council on the trading and traffic forbidden to clerics and religious—Communication from Apostolic Delegation.

DILLON OF BALMAIN Rev. Roger Wynne 200

- "CREATED ACTUATION BY THE UNCREATED ACT",
II, Rev. John P. Kenny, S.J. 210

BISHOP WILLSON, IV, Rt. Rev. Mgr. John H. Cullen, P.P., V.G., B.A. 224

MORAL THEOLOGY AND CANON LAW, Rt. Rev. Mgr. James Carroll, P.P., D.C.L. 235

Validity of Baptism conferred in certain Protestant sects—Legitimacy and Legitimation in Canon Law—Marriages performed by Pastor in another parish Church—Pauline Privilege and Non-Catholics—Convalidation of marriage contracted in fear—Marriage of Conscience or marriage in presence of witnesses only.

LITURGY Rev. Patrick Murphy, D.D. 246

Notes concerning the Church and its furnishings, IV (Rev. R. F. Donohoe)—The Prayer *Fidelium*—Bow to Cross after Last Gospel—Arrangement of mysteries of the Rosary for Days of the week—Suspension of indulgences during Holy Year—Common proper names with Latin equivalents.

HOMILETICS Rev. Walter Baker, D.D., Ph.D. 254

Praise of Mary.

NOTES 258

Some New Biblical Works—Biology Versus Catholic Philosophy: A New Approach.

BOOK REVIEWS 272

Letters and Shorter Works (St. John Eudes); *Praelectiones Biblicae*, N.T., vol. II (Simon-Prado); *The Eternal Priesthood* (Manning); *The Acts of the Apostles* (Trans. Knox); *St. Francis of Assisi* (Ed. Karrer); *We live with our eyes open* (Van Zeller); *The Admirable Heart of Mary* (St. John Eudes); *Now Welcome Summer* (Herlihy); *The Divine Crucible* (M. Austin); *Life of Dean O'Brien* (Egan); *Religion and the Rise of Western Culture* (Dawson); *Old Testament*, Vol. II (Trans. Knox) [See p. 258]; *L'Eglise Corps du Christ* (Goossens) [See p. 260]; *Israel and the Ancient World* (Daniel-Rops) [See p. 263]; *Star of the Sea over Crete* (Frean) [See p. 223]; *The Furrow* [See p. 234]; *The Spirit of God* (Martindale) [See p. 253]; *Papuan Conquest* (Dupeyrat) [See p. 257].

Nihil Obstat :

RICHARDUS COLLENDER

CENSOR DEPUTATUS.

Imprimatur :

✠ N.T. CARD. GILROY,

ARCHIEP. SYDNEYENSIS.

1a die, Julii, 1950.

Official Documents

PAPAL ACTS

During the first half of the present Holy Year of Jubilee, 1950, the following servants of God have received the honours of beatification:

Vincent Pallotti, Priest, an Apostle of Rome and a pioneer of Catholic Action, Founder of the Society of the Catholic Apostolate (Pallottine Fathers)—beatified, the 22nd of January.

Maria Desolata Torres Acosta, Virgin, Spanish Foundress of a Nursing Congregation of Servants of Mary—beatified, the 5th of February.

Vincentia Maria Lopez y Vicuna, Virgin, Spanish Foundress of the Daughters of Mary Immaculate for domestic service—beatified, the 19th of February.

Domenico Savio, adolescent, pupil of St. John Bosco—beatified, the 5th of March.

Paula Elizabeth Cerioli, widow Buzecchi-Tassis, Foundress of Sisters of the Holy Family—beatified, the 19th of March.

The following have been canonized:

Maria Wilhelma Aemilia de Rodat, Virgin, Foundress of Sisters of the Holy Family—canonized, the 23rd of April.

Antonio Maria Claret y Clará, Confessor Pontiff, Founder of the Missionary Sons of the Immaculate Heart of Mary—canonized, the 7th of May.

Bartolomea Capitanio and Vincenza Gerosa, Virgins, Foundress and Co-foundress of the Sisters of Charity, called after the Child Mary—canonized on Ascension Thursday, the 19th of May.

Jeanne de Valois, one time Queen of France, Foundress of Annunziata Sisters—canonized on Pentecost Sunday, the 28th of May.

Vincent Strambi, Passionist, Confessor Pontiff—canonized, the 11th of June.

Maria Goretti, Virgin and Martyr—canonized, the 25th of June.

*

*

*

*

SUPREME SACRED CONGREGATION OF THE HOLY OFFICE

INSTRUCTION

to local Ordinaries concerning "the Oecumenical Movement"

The Catholic Church does not take part in Congresses and other Assemblies that are called oecumenical. Nevertheless, as many Papal

documents show, the Church has never ceased and never will cease to favour all efforts to secure Christian unity. With every means that zeal can suggest and with continual prayers to God the Catholic Church has striven, and will continue to strive towards that great purpose which is so dear to the Heart of Christ, namely, that all who believe in Him "may be made perfectly one".

Indeed, the Catholic Church is a Mother, and with the tenderness of maternal affection she embraces all those who return to her as to the one true Church of Christ. In view of this, no praise and no cordiality of approval is too great to bestow on those campaigns and enterprises which are undertaken and launched, with the consent of Ecclesiastical Authority, for the instruction of prospective converts or for deepening knowledge of the faith in new converts.

At present, desire of unity is evidently growing. In many parts of the world, both through various external events and through internal changes in the minds of men, and above all through the general prayers of the faithful poured out with a fervour which comes from the grace of the Holy Spirit, this desire has implanted itself in the hearts of many who are separated from the Catholic Church, and is increasing from day to day. It is a desire that there may be a return to unity, a return of all who believe in Christ our Lord. This, of course, is a cause of holy joy in the Lord to all the children of the true Church. At the same time, it is an invitation to them to help all those who are sincerely seeking the truth, begging for them from God, with fervent prayers, the necessary light and strength.

The way to unity must, however, be properly conceived. Some endeavours made by various persons or groups with a view to reconciling dissident Christians with the Catholic Church, though animated with the best intentions, have not always rested on right principles, or if they have rested on right principles now and then, they are not without special dangers, as experience has proved. Consequently, this Supreme Sacred Congregation, on which the obligation rests of safeguarding the deposit of faith in its integrity and protecting it, has deemed it opportune to recall and to order the following points:

I. Since the aforesaid "reunion" belongs especially to the mission and office of the Church, it is the Bishops, "placed by the Holy Spirit to rule the Church", that must give particular care to the matter. Hence it is they that must exercise a diligent and effective vigilance over this whole movement; it is they that must prudently promote and direct it,

with a view to helping those who are seeking the truth and the true Church, and with a view to warding off from the faithful certain dangers, which easily come in the train of the activities of this "Movement".

Therefore, the Bishops must be quite aware of all that has been inaugurated or is going on in their dioceses in the name of the "Movement". In this task they shall be aided by competent Priests. They shall designate some such Priests, to pay attention, in the light of the teachings and rules issued by the Holy See, to all that pertains to the "Movement", and report to them on those matters in the way and at the time they shall appoint. Such documents as the Encyclicals *Satis Cognitum*, *Mortalium animos* and *Mystici Corporis Christi* should be the chief sources of their guidance.

Especial care should be given to publications brought out by Catholics on this matter, in whatsoever form they are published. Here the Bishops shall be watchful and shall insist on the observance of the sacred canons: "Concerning the previous censure of books and their prohibition" (can. 1384, f.). They shall not omit to do the same with regard to publications brought out by non-Catholics on the same matter, inasmuch as they may be printed or read or sold by Catholics.

Likewise the Bishops shall diligently provide what will be helpful to non-Catholics desiring to know the Catholic faith. They shall appoint persons and offices which the said non-Catholics can visit and consult. They shall exercise even greater diligence in making provision that new converts will easily find a means of more accurate and deeper instruction in the Catholic faith, as also of living a more actively Catholic life. This may be effectively done by arranging opportune meetings and gatherings, by bringing those converts to Spiritual Exercises and other offices of piety.

II. With regard to the way and method of procedure in this work, the Bishops themselves shall prescribe what is to be done and what is to be avoided, and they shall take care that their directions are observed by all. They shall likewise take vigilant care lest a false pretext such as: "the things that unite us are more important than the things that divide us" may lead to a dangerous indifferentism, especially amongst those who have little theological grounding and have not a well-formed mind on religious matters. Caution is also necessary in regard to what is now called the "irenical" spirit. Hereby Catholic doctrine—either in matters of dogma or truths connected with dogma—is sometimes forced into conformity or rather adaptation to the tenets of

dissidents. This kind of comparative study of different professions of faith, made with the vain desire of a certain progressive assimilation, will often result in detriment to the purity of some Catholic doctrine, or at least will result in wrapping the genuine and certain sense of the truth in obscurity.

The Bishops shall also eliminate those dangerous fashions of speech whereby false opinions are engendered and hopes that can never be fulfilled. Such fashions of speech are found in statements like the following: "What Papal Encyclicals say about the return of dissidents to the Church, about the constitution of the Church, about the Mystical Body of Christ are not to be pressed; not everything in those documents is of faith—(worse still): in dogmatic matters not even the Catholic Church has the fulness of Christ, but may be perfected by others". Bishops must firmly set their faces against such ways of speaking, and also against that method of dealing with the history of the Reformation and of the Reformers, which exaggerates the defects of Catholics and dissimulates the faults of the Reformers, or which sets things forth in such wise that accidentals are in the forefront, while the great essential point of lapse from the Catholic Faith is scarcely seen or felt. Lastly, the Bishops shall take care lest by excessive and false external activity or imprudence, or by an excited mode of procedure, more harm than good may be done to the cause.

Therefore, Catholic doctrine is to be set forth and explained *whole and entire*. No countenance should be given to the method of passing over in silence or covering over with ambiguous words what Catholic truth asserts about the true nature and way of justification, about the constitution of the Church, about the Roman Pontiff's primacy of jurisdiction, about the nature of the only true union, namely, the union realizable through the return of the dissidents to the one true Church of Christ. Let seekers be taught that in returning to the Church they are going to lose nothing of that good which by the grace of God has been produced in them; rather will that good be finished and perfected by this return. But here such language should not be employed as will give to understand that in returning they are bringing something substantial to the Church, something which was hitherto wanting in it. All those true things must be said clearly and openly, both because it is the truth which the persons themselves are seeking, and because outside of the truth a true union can never be found.

III. Let us now turn, in particular, to mixed meetings and con-

ferences of Catholics with non-Catholics. In recent times these have been held in many places, in order to foster "reunion" in faith. In regard to them, Ordinaries must exercise singular vigilance and control. On the one hand they offer a desirable occasion of spreading amongst non-Catholics a knowledge of Catholic doctrine hitherto little or imperfectly known to them; but, on the other hand, they easily expose Catholics to the dangers of indifferentism. Where some hope of good fruit seems to shine, the Ordinary shall see that the matter is properly handled, sending to those meetings Priests who are especially capable as expounders and defenders of Catholic doctrine. The Faithful shall not go to such meetings, except by special permission of Ecclesiastical Authority, which permission shall be given only to those who are known to be well instructed and strong in the faith. Where hope of good fruit does not appear, or if the matter has some special dangers for other reasons, the Faithful should be prudently kept away from such meetings; and the meetings themselves quickly dissolved or gradually caused to lapse. Moreover, since experience teaches that larger meetings of this sort usually bring little fruit and more danger, they should be permitted only after a most diligent examination.

To conversations between Catholic and non-Catholic theologians only Priests should be sent who have proved themselves really competent for such a task, both by their theological knowledge and by their firm adhesion to the Church's principles and rules in this matter.

IV. All the above-mentioned conferences and meetings, public and non-public, greater and smaller, held by agreement, in order that a Catholic group and a non-Catholic group, for the sake of discussion, may treat of faith and morals, each expounding the teaching of his own faith, and each having equal rights in the debate—these conferences and meetings are subject to rules of the Church which were recalled to mind in the Monitum: *Cum compertum* given by this Congregation, on the 5th of June, 1948. Mixed meetings are not forbidden; but they must not be held without previous permission of the competent Ecclesiastical Authority. The terms of the Monitum do not affect catechetical instructions, even when they are given to many at once; nor do they affect conferences in which prospective converts have Catholic faith expounded to them—even though the non-Catholics are allowed to set forth the teaching of their respective Churches for the purpose of setting in clear light the things in which their teaching agrees with Catholic doctrine, and in what it is at variance with Catholic doctrine.

Neither does the Monitum affect those mixed meetings of Catholics and non-Catholics, in which things of faith and morals are not discussed, the deliberations being on the ways of co-operation in the defence of the fundamental principles of natural law or of the Christian religion against the present-day enemies of God, or the discussions being on the renewal of social order or other questions of that kind. At these meetings also, of course, it is not lawful for Catholics to approve or concede anything which is not in agreement with divine revelation and with the teaching of the Church, even in social matters.

With regard to local conferences and meetings which come within the ambit of the Monitum as explained above, local Ordinaries are granted for a space of three years (computed from the date of this Instruction) the faculty of giving the requisite antecedent permission of the Holy See on the conditions: 1) that *communicatio in sacris* is altogether avoided; 2) that the discussions are carried on under proper inspection and direction; 3) that a report be sent to this Supreme Congregation, at the end of each year, stating in what places such meetings were held and what experiences resulted from them.

With regard to conversations between theologians, as mentioned above, the same faculty is granted, for the same space of time, to the Ordinary of the place in which these conversations take place; or to the Ordinary delegated by common consent of the other Ordinaries for the direction of this work. The conditions are as above, with this addition: that each year a report be sent to this Sacred Congregation on the questions handled, giving the names of those present and of the speakers on each side.

With regard to conferences and meetings which are interdiocesan, national, or international, special permission must be obtained each time, before the event, from the Holy See itself. The petition must say what matters are to be treated, and who the speakers are to be. Before permission is obtained, the external preparation of such meetings must not begin; neither can collaboration be offered to non-Catholics who are beginning such preparation.

V. While in all these meetings and conferences any *communicatio in sacris* must be avoided, the common recital of the Lord's prayer or of some other prayers approved by the Church is not excluded at the beginning and end of the proceedings.

VI. It is the right and the duty of each Ordinary to attend to this work in his own diocese. It is he that should promote and lead it.

Nevertheless, a suitable co-operation of several Bishops may be useful or even necessary in setting up offices and organizations which shall observe, examine, and direct this work as a whole. It will be for these Ordinaries to take common counsel and to investigate the means of securing uniformity and unity of action.

VII. Religious Superiors are bound to watch and see that their subjects keep strictly and faithfully to the injunctions of the Holy See and of the local Ordinaries in this matter.

The work of "the reunion" of all Christians is a truly excellent one. In order, therefore, that this union of all in the one true Faith and the one true Church may receive a more conspicuous place in pastoral care and in the common and ever more fervent prayers of the Catholic people, it will be helpful to instruct the people on these questions and inform them of the efforts being made. They should likewise know the rulings of the Church in this matter and the reasons of such rulings. This instruction may be given in various convenient ways, for example, by pastoral letters. All and especially Priests and Religious, should be stimulated to strive with their prayers and sacrifices to promote this cause and make it fruitful. At the same time all should be reminded that there is no better means of opening for non-Catholics a road to the truth and to the Church than that Catholics themselves should live a life of faith which shines with the lustre of good works.

Given at Rome, from the Palace of the Holy Office, the 20th day of December, 1949.

+ FRANCIS Card. MARCHETTI SELVAGGIANI,

Secretary.

Alfred Ottaviani, *Assessor.*

*

*

*

*

DECREE OF THE S.S. CONGREGATION OF THE HOLY OFFICE

PROSCRIPTION OF A BOOK
Wednesday the 8th of March, 1950.

At a general meeting of the Supreme Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office, their Most Eminent and Reverend Lordships, the Cardinals entrusted with the safeguarding of faith and morals, having heard the views of the Consultors, condemned and order to be inserted in the Index of Prohibited Books the work entitled:

"*Abscondida*, Diario da Irma Inês", compilado por M. da S. Maurão de Freitas, Porto, 1949.

And on Tuesday, the 14th day of the same month and year, Our Most Holy Lord Pius XII by Divine Providence Pope, in an audience granted to his Excellency the Most Reverend Assessor of the Holy Office, approved the resolution of the Eminent Fathers and ordered it to be published.

Given at Rome, from the Palace of the Holy Office, the 15th day of March, 1950.

P. Vigorita, *Notary*.

*

*

*

*

SACRED CONGREGATION OF THE COUNCIL DECREE

on the trading and traffic forbidden to clerics and religious

It is evident from many documents that secular business, especially trade and traffic, was in every age of the Church forbidden under grave penalties and censures to clerics called to the lot of the Lord.

Indeed the Apostle St. Paul in his second letter to Timothy (2: 4) already gave the warning: "No one who is serving God as a soldier entangles himself in the affairs of secular business". It is not surprising, therefore, that the Council of Trent (Sess. XXII, c. 1, de reform.), in dealing with those crimes, did not hesitate to decree that "whatever things had in earlier times been enacted by Supreme Pontiffs and Sacred Councils about the avoidance of secular business by clerics, the same things abundantly and wholesomely sanctioned by the said Pontiffs and Councils should be observed hereafter, under the same penalties or under greater penalties to be imposed according to the judgment of the Ordinary".

Adhering to those enactments the Code of Canon Law has set forth its legislation on this matter in the terms of canon 142: "Clerics are forbidden either personally or through others to carry on trade or traffic either for their own profit or for the profit of others". This prohibition affects Religious also, according to what is laid down in canon 592. Moreover, in canon 2380, the same Code surrounded this law with special sanctions: "Clerics or Religious, who personally or through others carry on trade or traffic against the precept of canon 142, shall be subjected to proper penalties by the Ordinary according to the gravity of their guilt". In order that ecclesiastical discipline on this head may be more uniform and in order that abuses may be guarded against, Our Most Holy Lord Pius XII, by Divine Providence Pope, has deigned to lay down that all Clerics and Religious of the Latin rite, of whom there

is question in canons 487-681, not even excepting the members of recent secular Institutes—that all such, who personally or through others exercise traffic or trade of any kind, even in money matters, whether they do so for their own profit or for that of others against the terms of canon 142, are held to be guilty of this crime and shall incur excommunication *latae sententiae* specially reserved to the Apostolic See, and if the case demands it, they shall also be subjected to the penalty of degradation.

Superiors who, according to their office and power, do not impede those crimes, are to be removed from office and declared unfit for any charge of government and administration.

Finally, for all to whose fraud or fault the crimes committed are to be attributed, the obligation of repairing the damages caused remains firm.

Everything to the contrary notwithstanding.

Given at Rome, the 22nd day of March, in the year 1950.

JOSEPH Card. BRUNO, *Prefect.*

F. Roberti, *Secretary.*

*

*

*

*

COMMUNICATION FROM THE APOSTOLIC DELEGATE.

The following communication was received from the Apostolic Delegate, His Excellency Archbishop Paul Marella, as the *Record* was being printed:

“In the April issue of the *Australasian Catholic Record* there was a note written by Rev. Dr. Madden (page 157 et seq.) about the Instruction of the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments of 1st Oct., 1949, regarding Mass without a server.

“His Eminence Cardinal Fumasoni Biondi, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda Fide has written to inform me that the faculties given for ten years by Propaganda (e.g. Formula Maior) represent particular indults given for missionary lands, which have altogether special needs, and must therefore be interpreted according to the sense of the words with which they are expressed. Such, for example, would be the case with Faculty No. 4 of the Formula Maior, which would not then have a restrictive interpretation, such as one might conclude from the Instruction of the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments”.

W. LEONARD.

Dillon of Balmain

Summary: Fr. Dillon one of the most colourful figures among our early pioneer priests—Education, ordination, notable contemporaries at All Hallows—Arrival in Sydney in 1861—Appointments to the Cathedral and to Armidale—Graphic description of missionary activities and difficulties in the New England district—In 1864 succeeds Fr. Therry at Balmain—Outstanding figure in the struggle for Catholic Education—Fiery speeches incur enmity of Government—Parkes' revenge and Fr. Dillon's dismissal from Cockatoo chaplaincy—Controversy between Vicar General and Colonial Secretary—Sir John Robertson brings the matter before Parliament—Long debate, sequel—Fr. Dillon visits Cockatoo to attend dying bushranger—Further trouble with Parkes—Repercussions.

About the middle of 1884 the Most Reverend Patrick Francis Moran, newly-appointed Archbishop of Sydney, was tendered a public banquet by the Rector of the Irish College, Rome. That event, comparatively insignificant no doubt in the life of the great Cardinal, deserves special mention because it brought together for the first time two remarkable priests whose lives must ever remain intimately associated with the story of St. Augustine's, Balmain. The younger of the two was none other than the late beloved Monsignor Hayden, then a very brilliant young student on the threshold of the priesthood, his future labours already dedicated to the service of Almighty God in Australia. The other, with whom we are more immediately concerned and whose chequered career we are now about to sketch, was the celebrated Monsignor George Francis Dillon, D.D., widely known author and lecturer, and for twenty years, during ten of which he had charge of St. Augustine's, one of the most notable figures in the fierce Education struggle of the 'sixties and 'seventies of last century.

A man of scholarly attainments and of strong opinions fearlessly expressed, it would be hard indeed to find a more colourful or more captivating personality, even among that truly noble band of unsung heroes, the Church Builders of Archbishop Polding's day. Pioneers in the strict meaning of the word, they were the faithful Old Brigade who kept alive and handed down in dark and evil days the flickering torch of faith first lighted on our shores by Father Therry himself. Their monuments, it is true, are still found in the churches and schools so liberally scattered over the Commonwealth, but unfortunately how many a thrilling story of privations, courage, devotion to duty, and triumph under great difficulties, has been allowed to pass into oblivion! Who will ever know the full truth of the "journeyings often, the perils in the city and the perils in the wilderness, the labours and painfulness, in

hunger and thirst and fastings often" which they gladly endured in this new and undeveloped continent? Surely we owe it to them to retrieve as much as possible of their glorious record. They sowed in tears that we might reap in joy; they planted that we might receive the increase. For our sakes and for our salvation

"They left the friendly stars astern, the Irish lights agleam,
They dared the seas in sailing ships before the days of steam".

Known to his youthful companions of college days as "Red" Dillon, to distinguish him from another black-haired alumnus of the same illustrious patronymic who afterwards rose to fame as the Founder of the *Southern Cross* of Argentina, it is eminently appropriate that the first fleeting glimpse afforded us of the future Monsignor in the yellowing newspaper records is that of an ardent young levite on the sanctuary of All Hallows Chapel, where we find him a candidate for Minor Orders in the summer of 1857: Among his companions on that solemn occasion was one William Fortune, whose subsequent sixty-three years' association with All Hallows has endeared him to many generations of students. Besides, Dr. Fortune, at least three other notable contemporaries were destined to become well-known in Australia as Bishop Moore, of Ballarat, Bishop Gibney, of Perth, and Monsignor James O'Brien, of St. John's College.

Coming to Sydney shortly after his ordination in 1861, Father Dillon ministered for two years at Old St. Mary's before being sent north to assist Dean Lynch in the Armidale district. Armidale for many years previously had been looked after single-handed by the celebrated Father Tim McCarthy, of horse-riding fame, whose extraordinary missionary activities and remarkable success in dealing with the bushranging menace are now matters of history. Some idea of the vastness of that distant province of the Archdiocese and of the difficulties then besetting it may be gleaned from the following brief quotation from a very eloquent and informative letter addressed by Father Dillon at this stage of his career to a friend in the Old Country: "I am serving a parish", he wrote, "as large as two provinces of Ireland and containing a scattered population of about three thousand Catholics. I am scarcely ever off the road. . . and often away from home for two months at a time. I do all my journeys on horseback, and many a day I do sixty miles in the saddle. . . Such spiritual desolation as I often strike I will not tell you of; still less can I tell you the joy and gratitude my visits bring to people

who have not seen a priest for years. All the gold in Australia is worthless compared with such an experience”.

But Armidale was not to be his home for long. With the death of Father Therry in 1864 Balmain was once more without a pastor and once again the Archbishop had to cast about for someone to fill the breach and man the walls of this old and historic fortress of Catholicity. The appointment of Father Dillon to succeed and carry on the work of the intrepid pioneer was an honour he remembered and recorded with pride twenty years afterwards, when he had taken reluctant leave of Australia and its problems forever. “I had the honour”, he says, “of knowing this good and great man at the period of his life when worn with years and labour he was expecting his reward. I succeeded him in the charge of the mission of Balmain. I was in the colony when it was full of his fame, and heard from his own lips much of what he had to endure in the early years of trouble. Though not endowed with a robust constitution, he travelled unceasingly. His home was with his scattered people wherever they were to be found. Houses were few and far between in those days. Frequently the bed of the missionary was the damp earth, and his covering the canopy of heaven. He soon made the acquaintance not only of every settlement but of every Catholic in the land. To the ruling powers, his influence seemed like some spell over his own people; and what was more, the influence which he exercised appeared to be equally potent over thousands of Protestants, and without exception over all the Protestants of the convict class. He devoted his life to that class. For Christ’s sake he loved them with an intense, devoted love, and the fiercest and the worst of them soon began to return his affection. They felt that if all the world else had deserted them, there was one who never would, one who was freely before their eyes, sacrificing his days, his health, his very life for them; one who never despised them. That one was Father Therry”.¹

To Balmain therefore Father Dillon came in 1864, and in him Balmain discovered its second apostle. Associated with St. Augustine’s during what was perhaps the most critical period through which the Church in Australia has ever passed, he proved himself a man after Father Therry’s own heart, and by his determined and fearless opposition to the petty tyrants of his day won for himself a place in the affections of his people which the passing of seventy years has not entirely effaced.

¹*The Virgin Mother of Good Counsel*, p. 629.

Always indefatigable in the cause of Catholic education, he immediately set about the erection of bigger and better schools. But his greatest achievement and the one for which we shall always cherish his memory was his introduction to the parish in 1864 of the first community of nuns. It was a proud day indeed when the Good Samaritan Sisters opened their first branch convent in Australia in a humble little house in Thames St., on the site now occupied by the Christian Brothers' residence. Besides teaching the children of the parish, the Sisters visited the sick, instructed the negligent Catholics, and weekly visited the Government Reformatory for girls at Cockatoo Island. To the training ship, "Vernon", and later to the "Sobraon", a floating reformatory for boys, the Sisters were frequent visitors, teaching and instructing the lads, many of whom owed their refractory ways to the want of a kind word of encouragement.

Meanwhile, however, dangers to Catholic Education were steadily increasing, denominational schools were being slowly but surely undermined, and a blow, intended to be fatal, was aimed at the entire Catholic System by the introduction of the Public Instruction Bill of 1866. Holding aloft the draft of the Bill at a public meeting, Henry Parkes had declared: "I hold in my hand what will be death to the calling of the Priesthood of the Church of Rome". Unfortunately for his cherished prediction, he had overlooked two most important factors: the indomitable zeal of that despised priesthood, and the enthusiastic loyalty of the Catholic laity.

In the fierce struggle for the souls of the little ones, Father Dillon could be relied upon to take a prominent part. With voice and pen he fought the Bill through all its stages, mercilessly exposing those responsible for it and earning for himself in return their implacable enmity. Indeed, so unpopular did he become with the Parkes-Martin Ministry that friends of the Premier were loud in their assertions that they would soon "get even" with this turbulent priest, this "Father Dillon, the red-headed villain", who had so long been a thorn in their side. In the course of a very heated debate in Parliament about this time the member for East Sydney, David Buchanan, after bitterly attacking a lecture delivered the week before by Dr. Forrest, Rector of St. John's College, continued in the following manner: "As an instance of the kind of influence that is being brought to bear against this Bill, and the scurrilous opposition with which it is being met by the Catholic priesthood, I will mention a circumstance that occurred last Sunday at Balmain. A

clergyman speaking from the altar thus declaimed to his congregation: 'It has been said that some of the Catholic laity are in favour of the Bill; Catholics forsooth! they are no Catholics. The head of the Ministry (Sir James Martin) is no Catholic, but a recreant and an apostate, who rears his children in a church that will ensure their going to hell'. The hon. member who told me this is a distinguished Catholic'.

Mr. Hart: "He is a distinguished liar".

Buchanan: "Then at St. Mary's the Rev. Mr. Keating said that the Colonial Secretary (Henry Parkes) was a fraudulent insolvent, and that every day he sat down to his meals he must be conscious that hundreds of widows and orphans were deprived of bread through his fraud. The same Rev. functionary called the Rev. and hon. member for West Sydney (Dr. Lang) a hoary old libeller. I believe he made references to myself also".

Mr. Egan: "Only as a distinguished brawler".

Mr. Donnelly: "I cannot understand the hon. gentleman's opposition to the clergy unless it is that he was once turned out of a Church in a state of drunkenness. But then for the same reason he might have a strong antipathy to the circus because I believe he was expelled also from a circus in a state of drunkenness".

An echo of the charges made by Buchanan is found curiously enough in a letter written by Archbishop Polding some months later from Sacred Heart, Darlinghurst, to his friend, Abbot Gregory.² "Dillon of Balmain", the letter states, "with his usual headlong indiscretion, spoke publicly of Parkes' antecedents and of Martin's apostasy. So also another, Keating, now gone to Rome to appeal against a sentence of the V.G. which never issued". It was rather unfortunate for the Vicar General, and indeed for all concerned, that the Father Tom Keating in question happened to be not only a close friend but a nephew of the Venerable Archdeacon McEncroe. But we shall speak of this later. Father Keating's first appointment in the Archdiocese appears to have been as assistant to the Rev. P. F. O'Farrell, at Bathurst. Previous to his coming to St. Mary's, he had been for some time Professor of Theology at Lyndhurst. On the eve of his departure for Rome he was farewelled by eight good men and true who, on behalf of "two hundred and fifty-seven fellow Catholics", presented him with a purse containing a hundred and sixteen sovereigns, and a lengthy address, portion of which read as follows: "We regret that this premature separation from

²*Benedictine Pioneers In Australia*, ii. p. 331.

a flock which has become deeply attached to you, should have been necessitated by a difference with the temporary ruler of the diocese. It is not part of our duty to enter into a discussion of the merits of your dispute with the Very Rev. Vicar General Sheehy, which has resulted in the appeal to a higher tribunal. . . It is sufficient for our course of action to know that the cause of that dispute involves no stain on your character as a gentleman or a priest, and that all we know of you makes us and our families greatly deplore your departure. We take leave of you with an anxious wish for a safe voyage, a satisfactory termination of your business with the Holy See, and a speedy return to Sydney".

In January, 1867, the Government set about "getting even" with Father Dillon. Without even the semblance of a charge being preferred against him, Parkes removed him from the chaplaincy at Cockatoo Island. This totally unjustifiable act on the part of the Colonial Secretary immediately raised a storm of indignation and led to one of the most celebrated controversies in Australian Church History. In the absence of Archbishop Polding, who was then in Europe, the Very Reverend S. J. A. Sheehy, V.G., stoutly refused either to recognise the suspension or to appoint a successor in the chaplaincy. "I have the honour to state", he wrote very respectfully when called upon to 'submit the name of a gentleman in place of the Rev. Mr. Dillon', "that nothing has been brought to my knowledge which renders it necessary or expedient that he should be removed from his office. Will you then kindly favour me with some account of the grounds on which I am desired to remove him?" The courtesy and graciousness which characterized this very reasonable request by the Vicar General were, however, conspicuously absent in the curt reply with which he was duly "favoured". "In your letter", he was rudely informed by an officious Under Secretary, "you say that nothing has been brought to your knowledge concerning the Rev. Mr. Dillon, which renders it necessary or expedient that he should be removed from his office, and you request to be informed of the grounds on which you are desired to remove him. I am desired by the Colonial Secretary to explain that you are not called upon to judge of the expediency of any course which the Executive may consider necessary in view of the public interest to adopt. You were not asked to remove Mr. Dillon, but it was thought that it might be convenient to you to know the intention of the Government". In the course of the following seven or eight months as many as twenty letters passed between the offices of the Vicar General and the Colonial Secretary without eliciting

as much as a single reason for the unjust dismissal. Then at last the matter reached a climax and attracted universal attention when Sir John Robertson made it the subject of much heated discussion in Parliament. Sir John was not a Catholic, but he was the uncompromising foe of all kinds of bigotry and injustice, and on this occasion he had quite a lot of interesting things to say about the audacious conduct of a civil servant using coarse and insolent language to the Dignitary of the Catholic Church.

What the Vicar General's courteous letters failed to elicit in six months Sir John's blunt censure motion produced in as many days. Realizing at last the desperate necessity of having something in the shape of a charge to lay before Parliament, the Under Secretary wrote on the 11th of June a hurried note to the Superintendent at Cockatoo Island, one Gother K. Mann: "I am desired to request you to state under your own hand the reasons which induced you to regard with uneasiness the conduct and influence of Mr. Dillon among the prisoners under your charge". The crisis was come at last. Now or never the damning guilt was to be fixed on Father Dillon, and the Colonial Secretary, who had suffered so much odium in dignified silence, was to be glorified before all men. Gother K. Mann was just the one to pull Parkes out of the ugly scrape into which he had fallen. Screwing his courage to the sticking point, the obedient superintendent took up his pen and wrote out the terrible indictment: "The Rev. Mr. Dillon, when he first entered on his duties at this establishment as Roman Catholic chaplain, said to me that if I did not comply with all his requests and if he did not get what he wanted here, he should "—fire the place?—No; throttle Gother K. Mann?—No; poison the Colonial Secretary?—No; but worse, "should apply to the Legislature. On another occasion", continued the letter, "Mr. Dillon said that he considered he had a right to agitate for political purposes anywhere and under all circumstances. Mr. Dillon subsequently suggested the propriety of separating the Roman Catholic prisoners from the other prisoners. After these expressions from Mr. Dillon, and more especially during the latter part of his chaplaincy, I observed a marked difference for the worse in the conduct and manner of Roman Catholic prisoners who behaved altogether in a way different from their demeanour formerly, and in a way that awakened in my mind serious suspicions". After this very terrible revelation, who could possibly have a good word to say in defence of Father Dillon!

Of Mann's three rather harmless looking allegations two were categorically denied by Father Dillon. For the third, that of proposing to separate the Catholic from the non-Catholic prisoners, responsibility was taken by Archdeacon McEncroe, who, in a letter to the Herald, admitted having suggested this procedure to Father Dillon as the one he had found most satisfactory himself in his dealings with prisoners at Norfolk Island. But the Archdeacon's sane suggestion weighed little with the great Sir James, who never tired during the two days' fiery debate of describing the proposed separation of the Catholic and non-Catholic prisoners as the greatest conceivable impropriety and the most convincing evidence of Father Dillon's total unfitness for the position of government chaplain. Willing and eager supporters of the Premier's efforts to discredit all things Catholic were not wanting, and for hours on end the House was treated to violent and bombastic tirades from Stewart of Wollongong, Buchanan of East Sydney, and the Rev. Dr. Lang, Presbyterian minister, who affected to see in the censure motion nothing but another instance of Romish aggression, a desire for Romish ascendancy and an excellent opportunity for forming a Protestant alliance. The cause of Truth and Justice found also good and faithful friends on both sides of the House, but unfortunately not in sufficient numbers to carry the day, and in the end Sir John Robertson's motion was defeated by thirty-seven votes to twenty. And thus ended most unsatisfactorily the long drawn-out dispute.

But before passing completely from this unpleasant subject which has already occupied more than its share of our limited space, one last incident deserves to be recorded. No sooner had the storm over the chaplaincy begun to show hopeful signs of finally subsiding than it was whipped once more to gale proportions by the most innocent of causes. Cockatoo Island at the precise time of which we write was the home of some particularly desperate criminals, and we have the evidence of Sir Henry Parkes himself, in the days before the Education question arose, that "the Rev. Mr. Dillon had worked greater reforms on that island than all the clergymen who had ever been there". Among the prisoners who were being thus reformed none, with the possible exception of Frank Gardiner, was more famous, or infamous, than James Clarke the bush-ranger. Clarke belonged to a very unfortunate family. His two brothers, Thomas and John, were hanged at Darlinghurst on June 25, 1867, and he himself narrowly escaped the same fate. After more than twelve months on the island he fell suddenly ill and a messenger was sent post

haste to St. Mary's. No priest being immediately available at St. Mary's, the message was referred to Balmain, and Father Dillon, ignoring as he was bound in conscience to do in the circumstances, the prohibition of the government, rushed to the island and administered the last Sacraments to the dying man. The end of that incident was not heard of for many a long day, and a great deal of good ink and much valuable time were wasted in endeavouring to placate the self-righteous anger and indignation of the high and mighty Colonial Secretary when he learned soon afterwards of what he chose to call "this gross disrespect for the decision of the government" and the "attempt to force the services of Mr. Dillon on a public establishment where you were made aware of his services were not considered desirable".

All this time the Vicar General, still at the controls of the Archdiocese, was under fire from all sides, and the sharpest shooting was not always from the enemy camp. For one thing, the Government seemed determined to find pretexts for closing as many as possible of the Catholic schools, including one in Castlereagh St. Then our old friend the Colonial Secretary, having unceremoniously dismissed Father Quinlevan from the care of the prisoners at Port Macquarie, was now raising a veritable storm in a tea cup over the transfer of Father Lanigan from Berrima to become Bishop of Goulburn and the substitution in his stead of Father McGuinn as prison chaplain. "It appears", Father Sheehy was insolently informed, "that you regard the chaplaincies in the gaols as ecclesiastical appointments. I am to inform you that the power which you appear to assume cannot be for a moment allowed or recognised". For a little while, however, it looked as if the Vicar General's patient long suffering was to be signally rewarded. About the middle of 1866 he was actually appointed Titular Bishop of Bethsaida and Coadjutor to the Archbishop. But imagine the general disappointment when a letter was received early in August from Cardinal Barnabo advising that the consecration be deferred until certain charges made against the Bishop-elect by a *testis fide dignus* had been cleared up in Rome! When Dr. Sheehy read the contents of the letter he there and then declined to have anything further to do with the appointment. In a desperate effort to get to the bottom of the whole perplexing affair Father Bazanti was immediately despatched to Rome. "From his sagacity and Italian experience", commented His Grace, "I expect he will ferret out a great deal". What the result of his ferretting was has never been made known; the identity of the trustworthy witness has not been revealed

and it would be unwise to speculate. But from a very significant passage in one of the Archbishop's letters³ it is clear that Archdeacon McEncroe and Father Dillon were certainly not in favour of Dr. Sheehy's consecration, and may not have been unconnected with active opposition to it.

When Father Keating, the victim and perhaps the cause of much misunderstanding, eventually returned from his wanderings, his uncle the Archdeacon was no more, having passed to his well-earned reward at St. Patrick's, Church Hill, on 22nd August, 1868, worn out by the incessant labours of thirty-six critical and crowded years during which he had been the heart and soul of every movement for the well being and advancement of the Church. His subsequent career was chequered and his death, in 1905, tragic in the extreme. On the day of his death he had been on a visit to Parramatta, and while awaiting the train for the return journey was reading his Office at the station. The train started unexpectedly, and, making an attempt to board it, he fell between the carriages. He died soon after the doctors had amputated both his legs in a desperate attempt to save his life.

Dr. Sheehy long continued as before to serve the Archdiocese faithfully and well, as Vicar General until 1874,⁴ and then as pastor successively of Windsor and Wollongong until advancing years and failing health compelled him to lay down his burden and retire from active duties in 1888. He died at Randwick in 1910. Although an estimable priest in every respect, he was hardly the type of leader that the perilous nature of the times demanded, and the strange intrigue that led to his refusal of the mitre was providential in this, that it prepared the way for the coming of Archbishop Vaughan, who by his fearless and unflinching acceptance of the challenge thrown down by Parkes was to rally and reorganize the scattered Catholic forces, instil new life and vigour into the weary, hard pressed leaders, and lay, even more deeply and securely than did Dr. Polding those of the great Cathedral, the massive foundations of the mighty edifice of Catholic Education.

(To be continued)

R. WYNNE.

³*Benedictine Pioneers In Australia*, ii. p. 331.

⁴In October, 1883, the *S.M. Herald* actually published the following front page announcement: "The Vatican has appointed the Rev. Father Sheehy, formerly Bishop-assistant to the late Archbishop Polding, to succeed the late Dr. Roger Bede Vaughan as Roman Catholic Archbishop of Sydney. The appointment is subject to the approval of the Government of New South Wales, and of the Bishops of the provinces of New South Wales and Queensland". What the source of the *Herald's* information was we do not know, but the naive remark about the necessity for Government sanction may be dismissed as just another instance of the wish being father to the thought.

"Created Actuation by the Uncreated Act"

II.

REFLECTIONS ON THE THEORY OF FATHER MAURICE DE LA TAILLE, S.J.

Summary:

Section 1: "*Reception-In*"; *Passive Actuation* :—

De la Taille's postulate of a created actuation 'received-in' the potency—his four arguments.

Difficulty of this position—metaphysical notion of 'reception-in'—dependence—change and 'passion' come from the efficient, not the formal, cause.

Section 2: *The Law of the Transcendent Act* :—

Cases where de la Taille sees a distinction between act and actuation—law of Transcendent Act—body-soul union.

The distinction de la Taille postulates must be real and adequate—but, then, what sort of reality is this really distinct information?—it cannot be accident, substance, mode, etc.—body-soul union explained more simply.

PART II: DOUBTS AND DIFFICULTIES.

Section I: "*Reception-In*"; *Passive Actuation*.

As you have seen in Part I, de la Taille conceives of the supernatural as being a unique union, an immediate union between God, as uncreated Act, and the creature, as potency. What will such a union involve? It will involve, answers de la Taille,¹ communication of the Act to the potency, reception of the Act in the potency; perfecting of the potency by the Act, a bettering, a change. Hence such a union means an actuation that is *received in* the potency, a communication that is limited by the potency. In short, in the hypothesis of divine actuation, you will necessarily have a created actuation, a passive actuation,² a 'reception-in' that partakes of the conditions of the potency, that will be, therefore, fragile and perishable and finite.

¹"Il y aura communication de l'Acte à la puissance; il y aura reception de l'Acte dans la puissance; il y aura perfectionnement de la puissance par l'Acte, amélioration, mutation".

(Recherches de Science Religieuse; 1928; pg. 254. See Part I, note I, for the list of sources).

²In an important passage, de la Taille thus draws a distinction between two kinds of actuation, active and passive; and it is only the passive actuation that he considers created and distinct from the act :—

"...j'accorde que l'actuation peut se prendre de deux côtés. Du côté de l'acte, elle est l'exercice de sa fonction actuante, ce qui s'appelle actuer (*acture*) ; et alors il est bien sûr qu'elle est quelque chose d'incrée; car elle ne se distingue pas plus alors de l'acte, que la cause première ne se distingue de sa causalité efficiente. Mais du côté de la puissance, il y a l'actuation passive, ce qui s'appelle être actué (*actuari*) : et cela n'est pas quelque chose d'immanent à l'Acte, lequel n'est nullement actué; mais une appartenance du sujet, un état de la puissance. Or ce qui se trouve appartenir à la puissance comme son état actuel, tient nécessairement de la manière d'être de la puissance, et par conséquent est fini comme elle".

(Revue Apologétique; 1929; pg. 132. Cf. also pgs.: 23, 133, 135, 138).

E. Mersch ("La Théologie du Corps Mystique"; Bruxelles; 1946) is much indebted to de la Taille here.

What reasoning leads de la Taille to assert this created and passive actuation that is 'received-in', measured to the capacity of, the creature-potency? As far as I can see, you can list out four arguments, explicit or implicit, that lead de la Taille to his position.³

First, de la Taille is deeply impressed by the vital, pulsing reality that actuation is:—

"Si on m'actue, je suis actué".⁴

If all actuation is a tangible reality, much more so is divine actuation. If God actuates, in very truth he actuates. The actuation of the infinite God cannot be just nothing. The keel of a ship may pass through water and leave no trace of its passage; but almighty God cannot act like that; if he decides to actuate, there will be an actuation; there must be *something*, some tangible reality; the creature will be touched to the very core of its being. It will bear the stamp of God's hand. Hence there must be a created actuation.

Secondly, passive must answer to active, reception to donation, "actuari" to "actuate".⁵ The terms are correlative. Granted, then, that God actuates, there must be in the creature something corresponding, something passive as the echo of God's activity. In brief there must be a 'passive' actuation IN the creature.

Thirdly, de la Taille emphasises much a statement of S. Thomas in 'Contra Gentiles' that when two things, not previously united, come into union, there must be a *change* in at least one of them.⁶ But this 'change' that S. Thomas so rightly requires—what is it but the created actuation IN the creature?

Fourthly (and this is not a distinct argument) de la Taille, being a theologian of outstanding calibre, cannot be content merely to assert that God and the creature are united in Act and potency. He asserts an

³Of course, besides the four arguments (which the narrow compass of this article permits to be stated only baldly) de la Taille is led to placing 'created actuation' by the 'data' of Revelation: to wit, that there exist both Sanctifying Grace and the 'Lumen Gloriarum'. Now these two realities are CREATED and also IN man. They invite de la Taille to his synthesis; and his hypothesis is acceptable only in so far as it can reasonably account for them.

Note that the passive actuation is CREATED because it is RECEIVED IN a finite subject. Says de la Taille:—

"ce qui est reçu, est reçu à la manière du sujet". (Recherches... 1928; pg. 266).

⁴Revue; pg. 132. "Si il n'y met rien, quel est son rôle?"—asks de la Taille pertinently about God's actuating.

⁵"Le passif suit l'actif avec la même nécessité qui, en regard de toute efficence divine, si immanente et incréée qu'elle soit, mettra toujours un terme créé". (Revue; op. cit.; pg. 132).

⁶Recherches...; 1928; pg. 255.

immediate union; as a metaphysician, he must indicate a 'ratio formalis' for this union. HOW is it that here there is an ontological union? A union, a metaphysical union is asserted—not a mere juxtaposition of God to the creature, not a simple presence of God to the creature, not the bare interplay of two dynamisms, not the mere interlocking of forces divine and human,⁷ but something far more wonderful, an ontological union of God with the creature, where God is Act and the creature is potency. What ontological reality can you point to that would speak to the mind as in some faint way showing the 'how' of such a union, its 'ratio formalis'? Thus de la Taille (so I interpret him), searching to lay bare something of the metaphysical structure of such a union, insists on the presence in the creature of this created actuation, this change 'received-in' the potency.

From all this, it seems to me that one can deduce a general law. De la Taille would maintain that there can be no union in the ontological order without change in the potency, without passive actuation, without 'reception-in' of something of the Act's.

No one will, I think, discard as shallow or flimsy de la Taille's position and the reasoning on which it is based. Yet is it convincing? While I profess myself second to none in admiration for de la Taille, I cannot help giving voice to doubts and hesitations.

First I would ask how far a metaphysical union is bound up with 'reception-in' of the form or act, or the communication of the form or act? Does all union in the metaphysical order imply a 'reception-in'?

There is no slight danger here of imagination playing us tricks. In the physical order, 'reception-in' is a gross, factual reality. You receive a guest into your house, you put a peg into a hole, milk is poured into a pail. But in the metaphysical order, does 'reception-in' keep its crude, literal sense? Look at matter and form. Again and again you find thinkers of the utmost precision of thought and expression speaking of

⁷About the strict union fathered by material and formal causes, Rickaby rightly observes:—

"Not by mere mutual interaction, but by mutual self-communication, they combine to produce the total effect". ("General Metaphysics"; London; 1905; pg. 301).

Emile Mersch has a passage which would epitomize well de la Taille's thought. (Mersch, however, is thinking exclusively of the Hypostatic Union):

"A moins de ramener cette union à rien, à un accollement local, à une jonction mécanique, à une fiction juridique, il faut admettre dans l'humanité assumée quelque chose qui la constitue en humanité assumé, quelque chose qui sera humain, puisqu'il sera à elle, mais qui sera divin parcequ'il la constituera humanité de Dieu". (Op. cit. vol. II; pg. 344).

form being *received in matter*.⁸ Yet, clearly, there can be no question of literal, visible 'reception-in'. Such a tenuous shadowy entity as matter cannot *receive into* itself form or anything else; it is too fragile and lowly in the scale of being to be capable of so dignified and elevated proceeding.

Hence unless you wish to accuse the most sober and measured thinkers (S. Thomas among the band) of allowing their imaginations to run away with them, you will be forced to admit that in metaphysics the 'reception-in' of form or act has some deeper meaning than the surface one.

In metaphysics 'reception-in' would certainly seem to betoken a union, a real ontological union. Hence you speak of form being 'received-in' matter when these co-efficients are united. But this is not enough. 'Reception-in' does not mean any and every sort of union in the metaphysical order. But only a union of *dependence*, a union where the form or the act *depends* on the matter of potency. Hence the greater the dependence, the more thorough the 'reception-in'. Conversely, the less the dependence, the less, likewise, the 'reception-in'. And should you have a real metaphysical union where the form or act in no wise depends on the matter of potency, there you will have no 'reception-in' of the form or act or anything of the form's or act's.

The metaphysical significance of 'reception-in' will become clearer if you weigh the case of material form and matter against that of soul and body. The gap that separates these two cases is, ontologically speaking, enormous—a yawning chasm. The dependence of material form on matter is utter, reaching down to the stark impossibility of existence without the support and prop of the matter. It is not just a question of a material form, stripped of matter, leading a sort of maimed existence; it is a question of sheer and radical inability to exist without

⁸For example:—

S. Thomas: "...forma quodammodo est IN materia..." (de Div. Nomin. 4/9).
John of S. Thomas: "Forma reducitur in actum ut recepta IN materia, et NON EXTRA ipsam" (Cursus Philosophicus; Reiser's edition; Turin; 1937; II; 227/A/25).

de Finance speaks of form as being "intérieure à la matière". (Etre et Agir; pg. 113).

Nys (treating of the relation of form—'ce principe spécifique'—to matter):—"il la revêt de sa propre réalité, ou mieux, il se communique si intimement au sujet matériel, que celui-ci, pénétré de toutes parts de cette détermination foncière, devient un Corps déterminé". ("Cosmologie"; II; Louvain; 1918; pg. 23).

Cf. Gregorianum; 1926; pg. 95, etc.

the aid of matter. Truly, indeed, do you speak of form being 'received-in' matter, for you have here absolute dependence.

In the case of body and soul, you have a union that is no less intimate, penetrating, metaphysical. But the dependence is quite different. Though the soul does form one being with the body, it has immortality by birthright, and will outlive the dissolution of its material counterpart. Moreover, whether united to the body or free, it always exercises its salient and most characteristic functions in INTRINSIC INDEPENDENCE of the body. Hence so much more shallow is its dependence on the body than the form on matter that the term hardly has the same meaning; and if you can speak of the 'reception-in' of a material form, you will scarcely do so of the soul. With great pleasure I quote, in support of my contention, the words of that outstanding philosopher, John of S. Thomas⁹:—

"when a form is not educed from matter it is united to matter WITHOUT RECEPTION, BECAUSE such a form is created independently of matter, and IN ITS INDEPENDENCE is united to matter".¹⁰

This case of the body-soul union is instructive. If in the natural order you can have an intimate, metaphysical union, where both dependence and 'reception-in' are so whittled away, can you not look further to the possibility (perhaps in the supernatural order) of a strict metaphysical union where both the dependence and the 'reception-in' have reached vanishing point? And such is precisely the case of pure actuation that de la Taille postulates. Hence you query: if de la Taille postulates a pure actuation as distinct from information (a distinction that he has marked with rare force and clarity), why now does he demand an element that will be a sheer information, a 'reception-in', the communication of the Act as received?

However, the question is not yet settled. You recall the four excellent reasons that de la Taille gives in favour of his created, passive actuation. It seems to me that there is danger of equivocation here. To make this clear, let me point out, following John of S. Thomas,¹¹

⁹Pègues has this brief eulogy of John of S. Thomas:—

"Son 'Cursus philosophicus' n'a peut-être pas été dépassé, comme exposé de 'la pensée vraie, exacte, et g  nueine d'Aristote et du Docteur Ang  lique.'" ('Initiation Thomiste'; Paris; 1921; pg. 379).

¹⁰'Cursus Philosophicus'; Reiser's edition; 229/B/24.

¹¹See (op. cit.) the two excellent sections John of S. Thomas has on material and formal causes. On 226/A/46 he writes:—

...."causalitas materiae est concursus passivus, a quo forma dependet...., qui nihil est aliud, realiter quam ipsa passio illata ab agente, non prout ab agente, sed prout in materia, et ista causalitas servit tam ad formam quam ad compositum".

that in every metaphysical union an efficient cause is at work, bringing together the terms to be united. The causality of this efficient cause is 'action' and to that action there must answer always a 'passion'. This 'passion' is in the 'patient', in the potency or the matter. In de la Taille's words, it is,

"une appartenance du sujet, un état de la puissance".¹²

It is a change of the subject, coming from the agent's activity, but arising (as John of St. Thomas insists¹³) *out of* and *in* the matter or potency. It is the passage of the matter or potency from its 'actus primus' to its 'actus secundus'.

John of S. Thomas' thought would not seem to square with de la Taille's. While both would demand with S. Thomas himself that in every union there should be some new element, some change, something passive, John of S. Thomas would regard this change and 'passion' as the effect of efficient, not formal, causality. De la Taille asserts that this passive element is the effect of quasi-formal activity, for it is the Act's self-communication as 'received-in' the potency.

Hence when de la Taille asserts that passive*answers to active, one will distinguish: this is true of efficient causality—yes;¹⁴ that it is true of formal causality—'peto probationem'. When de la Taille insists on a change in every new union, you will agree on the need of some new element, you will deny that it is to be identified with his created, passive actuation. When, again, he wants to point to some tangible reality as the 'ratio formalis' of the union, you will point to the 'passion' but insist that it comes from the efficient, not from the quasi-formal, cause. Lastly, when de la Taille insists that if God actuates, he must *do* something, you will, perhaps, answer, that God certainly does do something, he communicates himself and brings about an intimate, metaphysical union. But you will add that if the uncreated Act chooses to communicate HIMSELF, he does, quite simply, communicate HIMSELF, and that therefore his communication, being his *self*-gift, will necessarily and

¹²Revue; 1929; pg. 132.

¹³John of S. Thomas. op. cit.; 227/A/I:

"...passio ista seu mutatio et passivus concursus habet materiam pro principio passivo et formam pro termino et est ratio, per quam dependet forma a materia..."

Again, 227/A/II:—

"...agens enim, quod nullum habet subiectum, nullam infert passionem".

¹⁴Note de la Taille's own words, where to elucidate his position he appeals to EFFICIENT causality:—

"...le passif suit l'actif avec la même nécessité qui, en regard DE TOUTE EFFICIENCE DIVINE, si immanente et incréée qu'elle soit, mettra toujours un terme créé". (Revue.; pg. 132).

always be UNCREATED. How can the SELF-communication of the infinite God be other than UNCREATED?

Section 2: The Law of the Transcendent Act.

It is of the quintessence of de la Taille's theory that an actuation can be distinct from its act. Not, of course, that he imagines that every actuation is distinct from its act, every information from its form. He postulates this distinction only where the act transcends its potency, the form its material co-efficient. When the act can outlast its potency and subsist in its own right, then, and only then, will there be an actuation distinct from the act.¹⁵ For these cases of a transcendent act, de la Taille frames a law, thus:—

"Generally speaking, in every case when the ACTUALIZING PRINCIPLE is of a kind to exist by itself, its communication (natural or supernatural) to a RECEPTIVE POWER will partake of the conditions of the latter, and therefore, be different from the former".¹⁶

This is what I call de la Taille's 'Law of the Transcendent Act'; I propose to examine it now.

In order to prove his contention that there can be a created actuation coming from the uncreated Act, that actuation, consequently, is not always the same thing as act, de la Taille makes appeal to the body-soul union. This appeal is not made once only, or in passing; but in every place where he has propounded his theory.¹⁷ And on this case in the natural order, he bases an 'a fortiori' argument for the action of God in the supernatural.¹⁸ Controversially this is very fortunate, for it implies that you can focus your attention on an example within your ken; and if the law of the transcendent act proves faulty here, you will look on it askance in the supernatural, too. Hence we can narrow down our examination chiefly, but not exclusively, to the union of soul and body in man.

The soul communicates itself to the body; it is an act, actuating the

¹⁵'Mysterium Fidei'; 515/A. Cambridge Lecture; pg. 184. *Recherches...*; pgs. 265-66. *Revue*; pgs. 131-132.

¹⁶Cambridge Lecture, pg. 184.

¹⁷The passages in *Recherches* and the *Revue Apologétique* are very important and explicit. They are too long to be quoted here. Reference is given to them in note 15 above.

¹⁸E.g. in the *Recherches*-article, pg. 266:—

"...Telle est la condition particulière du corps humain, en conséquence de l'immortalité de l'âme. Mais à bien plus forte raison y aura-t-il lieu de distinguer entre les deux acceptions de l'existence, quant on envisagera l'actuation d'une nature créée par l'Acte pur de l'être...."

body, a form¹⁹ informing the body. This communication, this actuation, this information, argues de la Taille, must be distinct from the soul that communicates, actuates, informs. Why? Because the soul is spiritual and immaterial, enduring and imperishable. But the communication or actuation, precisely as received, is none of these; it is corporeal and material, ephemeral and perishable.

"If the information of my body by my soul is something ephemeral, if the animation of my physical organism is corruptible, if my bodily life is fragile, it is obvious that neither my life is the vital principle (which is immortal), nor is the animation my soul (which is incorruptible), nor is the information the form (which is imperishable)".²⁰

The radical reason why this actuation or information is other than the act or form is because the act or form subsists, outlasts the body, is transcendent to it. What then, asks de la Taille, if you should have an act that not only subsists, but, besides, is uncreated? Assuredly *there* you will have distinction between act and actuation.²¹ So he applies his findings to the Hypostatic Union:—

"We speak therefore of an actualizing principle, uncreated and eternal, but communicated in time on a certain day, which was that of the Annunciation. The communication, therefore, is not eternal, it had a beginning: it might, if God willed, have an end. And, not being eternal, it is not uncreated, but created; while, of course, being absolutely supernatural".²²

You must pause a minute to realise precisely what sort of distinction de la Taille is claiming for this actuation or information. In all the cases where the law of the transcendent act is exemplified de la Taille conceives of the actuation or information as a reality distinct from the

¹⁹Cf. Denziger-Umberg; n. 481: Concilium Viennense; Oecumenicum XV. Fr. Boyer (de Deo Creante et Elevante; Rome; 1933; pg. 156-69) has an interesting discussion on this definition. Cf. also Denz.-Umberg; n. 738; Concil. Lateran. V; Oecum. XVIII. Gredt reminds us:—

"obwohl geistig, ist sie (i.e. Menschenseele) dennoch ihrem Wesen nach Körperform und hat eine wesentliche Beziehung zum Stoffe". (Divus Thomas; Fr.; 1933; pg. 279).

²⁰De la Taille's own words:—

"Si l'information de mon corps par mon âme est chose éphémère, si l'animation de mon organisme physique est corruptible, si ma vie corporelle est fragile, il est clair que ni ma vie n'est le principe vital, immortel: ni l'animation n'est l'âme, incorruptible; ni l'information n'est la forme, impérissable..." (Revue; pg. 131).

²¹"Mais déjà dans l'ordre naturel, il y a lieu à différence, et à distance très grande, entre actuation et acte, quand l'acte n'est pas pure forme informante. A plus forte raison, la différence et la distance s'imposent si l'acte n'est pas seulement subsistant, mais incréé". (Revue; pg. 131-132).

²²Cambridge Lecture; pg. 183.

reality of both act and potency. The actuation in the Hypostatic Union he describes as being—

“new, no less than created; truly positive; no mere amputation: new and positive, but also substantial”.²³

In the case of Grace this actuation is conceived as being not substantial, but accidental—able, therefore, to be gained and lost and gained again; able to come and go. So distinct from the act is the actuation that one can be uncreated and the other created; or one a substance and the other an accident; one everlasting the other ephemeral. It is clear, therefore, that there must be a real and adequate distinction between act and actuation.²⁴ A real, but inadequate, distinction, such as you have between a part and the whole, is not enough to square with the evidence such as you have it in de la Taille's writings.

Keeping these points in mind, you can now raise the following query about the information of the soul that de la Taille postulates as being distinct from the spiritual form, the soul's self. What sort of reality is this information or actuation? Is it an accident, or a substance? If a substance, is it a complete or incomplete substance? Or, if none of these, perhaps it is a mode? Finally is it like substantial existence, that is none of these realities, yet a reality and a reality that actuates in the substantial order? Take each of these questions in turn.

1) This really distinct information cannot be an accident. For, to mention no other reason,²⁵ a substantial form (like the soul) cannot inform accidentally. When a substantial act actuates, it necessarily

²³ibid. pg. 184.

²⁴In the Revue; pg. 136, you find these words:—

“Nous en revenons forcément à situer *en dehors de l'acte*....cette actuation passive...”

Or in the Cambridge Lecture; pg. 183, you read:—

“There is a difference, therefore, between the thing communicated and its communication. THE ONE IS NOT THE OTHER”.

²⁵Another reason that decisively militates against the information in the body-soul union being characterized as accidental is the good Thomist assertion that no accident can come before the substantial form. An accident, being but an ‘ens entis’, belongs to an ‘ens-quod’, to a substance already established and essentially fully equipped; it cannot precede the constitution of a substance. (Cf. S. Thomas; Q. unica de Anima; art. 9/c).

I do not forget that de la Taille repeatedly affirms that actuation is simultaneous with act, that it is not previous to the union of act and potency (cf. Recherches; 1928; pg. 255; & Revue; pg. 13. Also, Theolog. Studies; 1941; pgs. 514 & 518). Nevertheless, this objection keeps its edge; for, ‘ex hypothesi’, the actuation is the act as communicated, the contact of the act with the potency; only in it and by it does the act reach the potency. Given, therefore, a real distinction of actuation from act, there is necessarily some sort of priority of actuation over act, information over form. The actuation or information touches a potency not already touched by a substantial act or form.

actuates substantially. Why? Because actuation (information) is the communication of the act's self to the potency. And if the act or form that gives itself is substantial, substantial too must be the communication or actuation. So for this reason alone it would seem that the information of the body by the soul cannot be an accident.

In the natural order it seems clear that the supposition of a substantial form's informing accidentally, giving ITSELF accidentally, is preposterous. What of the supernatural order? Could the uncreated Act communicate HIMSELF accidentally (de la Taille's hypothesis in the case of Vision and Grace)? Frankly, I do not understand how the SELF-gift of almighty God can be other than both uncreated and substantial.

2) The really distinct actuation cannot then be accidental. Perhaps it is a complete substance? Merely to put this question is to answer it. Only the 'compositum' of body and soul is a complete substance; and this information is within the 'compositum' and belongs to it. If it were a complete substance, it would be a being in its own right. De la Taille, of course, never dreams of asserting that the distinct actuation, whether in the natural or the supernatural order, could be a complete substance.

3) Is the information to be conceived as an INCOMPLETE substance, as a substantial principle like act or potency, or, better, an 'ens-quo', like matter and form? But this, too, is impossible. Were this possible, you would have man not composed, as we all have always maintained, just of body + soul; rather he would be composed of body + information + soul; There would be three substantial, metaphysical principles in man's structure. To hold this, would be to ride rough shod over the well-established tenets of act and potency, matter and form. The whole structure of Thomistic metaphysics is reared upon the assertion that all composite beings contain (in the essential order) two principles—potency and act, matter and form. Whether you deny these two coefficients or postulate a third, you equally undermine at its very base Thomistic philosophy.²⁶ And no one has grasped this more strongly than de la Taille himself.²⁷ Therefore again we must

²⁶As Gredt puts it:—

"Das ganze thomistische Lehrgebäude ruht schliesslich auf der Grundlage des sachlichen Unterschiedes zwischen dem Akt und der ihn beschränkenden Potenz. Diese Grundlage ist aber sehr gesichert..." (Divus Thomas; 1933; pg. 286).

²⁷"Il n'y a de principes intrinsèques de l'être que la puissance et l'acte..." (Revue...; pg. 130).

say that this real and really distinct information or actuation cannot be an incomplete substance.

4) Can it be a mode? Perhaps here is a felicitous solution: one might thus account for its reality and its real distinction from the form or act.

Unhappily, however, this solution too must be rejected. No one would reject it more vehemently than de la Taille himself who regards modes as metaphysical abominations, as a sort of tainted and poisoned food that no healthy metaphysician can swallow and retain. And he wishes to banish from philosophy and theology all modes precisely because a mode can be reduced neither to act nor to potency, "which however divide all created reality".²⁸

5) Lastly there remains the possibility that the information or actuation may be a reality like existence—THE reality—neither substance nor accident, neither mode nor incomplete substance, but a reality, nevertheless, in the substantial order.²⁹ So de la Taille conceives the actuation in the Hypostatic Union. It is a positive reality in the substantial order, like substantial existence.

Possibly this solution might avail in the Hypostatic Union; but it is of no help in the other cases. For both Grace and the 'Lumen glorie' are conceived by de la Taille as *not* being substantial actuations, but only accidental. Then in the fundamental and crucial example of the body-soul union, this solution is impossible. For in the union of body and soul you are looking at an actuation or information in the essential, not the existential, order. But substantial existence, of course, actuates ONLY in the EXISTENTIAL order, and actuates, therefore not just the material counterpart, not just the body, but the man, the essence already conceived as fully constituted of body + soul. The information that is postulated as distinct from the soul is in the essential order; it comes in and within the constitution of the ESSENCE of man.

Hence I find myself hemmed in by weighty objections, whatever title I use to describe this reality of de la Taille's—this information that

²⁸"Toute cette théorie des modes substantiels fait éclater la doctrine, par ailleurs très assurée, qui est à la base de toute métaphysique thomiste: le doctrine des principes de l'être". "Le vice de tout mode substantiel, c'est qu'il est 'irréductible lui-même à l'acte ou à la puissance, qui pourtant divisent tout l'être des créatures'." (Revue.; pg. 130).

Cf. Nys; Cosmologie; pg. 59; n. 39.

²⁹Revue.; pg. II.

is really distinct from its form, this actuation that is really distinct from its act. It seems to me that de la Taille is faced with a dilemma:

Either he must renounce his claim that the information is REAL; OR he must renounce his assertion that the information or actuation is REALLY DISTINCT from the form or act. I cannot see, particularly in the basic case of body and soul, how the information can be both a REALITY AND at the same time REALLY DISTINCT from the form. But the information is certainly real. De la Taille would insist on that—so would everyone. Hence it cannot be really distinct.

At this stage you may ask: if you put aside de la Taille's explanation of the union between body and soul—an explanation which at first blush, at least, is so plausible—what other can you offer in its stead?

It seems to me that the case of body and soul is susceptible of a simpler and more obvious explanation than de la Taille's. It is true that the soul outlasts the body and transcends it. But is this the crucial point in the explanation of the union? Does this make it necessary to postulate an information really distinct from the form? Is not the crucial point the fact that the soul is in very truth the FORM of the body? Can you not, therefore, find a simple explanation of the union in the essential nature of formal causality?

What happens when a form begins to exercise its function of information? You have extrinsic conditions that favour this exercise of causality, you have both the matter and the form brought into union by exterior, efficient cause; you have the transit of the form from first to second act; you have the information of the matter by the form. What you do NOT have is the addition of any new entity to the form. The form is now informing, whereas, before its application to matter by the efficient cause, it was not informing. Its information is merely its self-gift to the matter, its self-communication. No entitative change takes place in the form. In the whole process the only entitative changes are in the presence of extrinsic conditions, and the 'passion' wrought in the matter by the operation of the efficient cause.

Such is the explicit, frequently repeated teaching of John of St. Thomas;³⁰ such is the meaning, I am convinced, of the famous text in St. Thomas himself:

³⁰Here are some of the many passages that might be cited from John of S. Thomas:—

"effectus formalis non distinguitur intrinsece entitative ab ipsamet forma ut communicata" (op. cit. 234/A/47); "...effectus formalis a forma non distinguitur..." (236/A/14); "(forma) causat...per actualitatem, quae secundum

"Forma autem PER SEIPSAM facit rem esse in actu..."³¹

The difference between a form BEFORE it begins to inform and AFTER it has begun is not entitative but only of extrinsic denomination. The information adds no entity to the form; it is merely the form as standing under the denomination of actually giving itself.

What John of St. Thomas teaches about material form and its relation to the information that proceeds from it, he also teaches, and, it seems to me, must so teach about the soul as form and its relation to the information that proceeds from it. Hence the fact that the soul transcends the body and is nobler as form than the purely material form seems not to make the slightest difference here. Thus, given the necessary preparatory and extrinsic conditions, together with the creative activity of the First Cause, the soul commences to give itself to the body. This information continues till the union is confronted by some hostile efficient cause, strong enough to split it asunder. The soul is, then, separated from the body; but since it is an 'ens-quod' it will not, like the separated material form, perish from metaphysical inanition, but rather will continue to lead unencumbered its characteristic soul-life.

In all this, why postulate any distinction between information and form? You have only to postulate two elements—body and soul, together with, first, extrinsic conditions favourable to union + an efficient cause to produce that union; then, later, extrinsic conditions inimical to union and a disrupting efficient cause. During the union the soul informs the body with an information which is simply, entitatively, itself. After the union, the soul remains entitatively what it was before; in losing its information it has not diminished in reality, it has suffered no subtraction of being; it has merely ceased to be *self*-communicating to the body. But there is no reason to postulate an information that is a reality in its own right and a reality adequately distinct from both soul and body. De la Taille's 'Law of the Transcendent Act' certainly seems to be 'not proven'.

In these two sections I have marked my reserves, my hesitations and doubts about de la Taille's splendid synthesis. I have others

se est determinata ad actuandum, reducit enim et tollit indifferentiam materiae; et seipsa immediate actuat, quando recipitur et conjungitur materiae, neque indiget nova actualitate superaddita, ut materiam reddat actuatam et compositum constituat". (234/B/45).

³¹Summa Theologica; 1/76/7/c. "Ce texte", comments de Régnon, "ne peut pas être trop médité". It is confirmed by a passage in *de Anima* (art. 9/c):—
"...cum forma secundum seipsam det esse materiae, secundum seipsam unitur materiae primae, et non per aliud aliquod ligamentum".

besides these, but for them there is no room. In conclusion I should like to record that if I am a critic of de la Taille, I am also a critic of my own criticisms. I do not assign to them more than a note of probability. I cannot criticise with any confidence de la Taille whom many would join with me in naming:

"prince of modern theologians".

J. P. KENNY, S.J.

* * * *

SHORT NOTICE

STAR OF THE SEA OVER CRETE. Practical wartime experiences and simple explanation of the devotion to Our Lady of Perpetual Succour. By Fr. W. Frean, C.S.S.R. 123 pages. Price, 3/6. Majellan Press, Pennant Hills, N.S.W.

War is complex—a fact which enables it to be studied from several aspects. Many are of the opinion that nearly all of them have been utilised, but in this treatment Fr. Frean demonstrates that such is not the case. He has given us a record of experiences gained as a chaplain in the last war, and also as a representative of God in the greater and more important struggle between the forces of good and evil, with this world as the battleground, and with men as the direct combatants in both cases.

Prefacing the two main sections of the work is an admirably full, yet simple, explanation and justification of the honour paid to Christ's Mother by Catholics, and also of the actuality of miracles. These two elements are linked together in the subsequent narrative which has as its constant background the famous and miraculous painting of Our Lady of Perpetual Succour.

The first part of the book concerns the practical side of devotion to Mary under the above title. The approach is a personal one. Fr. Frean was with the Forces in Crete and had with him a small representation of the painting given him by a child in Australia. The story of the vicissitudes of that picture and the results of devotion to it will be of interest to a wide audience, since the manner of presentation is simple and informal, and again, because the characters mainly concerned are the Anzac troops whose exploits always provide welcome reading for Australians and New Zealanders.

In the second section of the work the theoretical and historical side of the devotion is presented. The full meaning of the symbols embodied in the painting is given, and also an interpretation of the title, "Mother of Perpetual Succour". The author has included in this part some manifestations of the power of Mary selected from his own experiences.

This book is a worthy and valuable contribution to the Cause of the "Star of the Sea", who, as St. Ambrose says, "is the polar star that guides men safely to the harbour of salvation", and from it the reader gains a new appreciation of, and trust in the Mother of Perpetual Succour.

M.N.

Bishop Willson, IV.

Summary: The prison settlement at Norfolk Island—Conditions on island—Convicts transferred to Van Dieman's Land—Fresh convict establishment in Norfolk Island (1825)—Dr. Polding gives Dr. Willson spiritual care of the island—Dr. Willson visits island in 1846—His impressions of the situation—Goes to England—Evidence before House of Lords on state of Norfolk Island—High hopes of success on return to Hobart in 1849—Visits penal settlement in 1849—Evidence of progress on island—Sends *Report* to Sir W. Denison—Bad state of Norfolk Island—Dr. Willson's campaign for suppression of penal settlement—Final Victory in 1852-55.

NORFOLK ISLAND.

Cruel in truth, was a judicial sentence of transportation to Botany Bay, the penal settlement set up in New South Wales towards the end of the eighteenth century. But a still more appalling fate was held in reserve for malefactors convicted of fresh crimes in that unhappy region. They were banished to Norfolk Island so aptly described by the Irishman, Joseph Holt, as the dwelling place of the doubly-damned. This Island, discovered in 1774 by Captain Cook, lies nearly one thousand miles east and slightly north of the latitude of Sydney. It is just a speck in the ocean measuring only five miles long and three miles wide. Convicts were landed there in 1788, the year the "First Fleet" reached Australia.

Even away in that hell of the Pacific hardened criminals, ill-used and desperate men never admitting defeat, went on to explore new fields for the exercise of perverse ingenuity. Immediate and ruthless chastisement always attended the exposure of dangerous conspiracies: yet, neither corporal punishment nor increased severity of prison discipline could prove efficient as instruments of intimidation or reform. For these outcasts of human society death itself had no terrors to unfold, no features to inspire fear or to excite repentance.

On Norfolk Island, within a few years of its occupation, disorders moral and physical multiplied to an alarming extent. In addition to this the supervision and upkeep of a remote and expensive establishment was becoming a task too burdensome for the British Imperial Government. Another prison, therefore, had to be substituted. Where was it to be? Why not use the island of Van Diemen's Land so admirably adapted to requirements? This proposal won the support of the statesmen charged with the care and development of the latest possessions in the southern

hemisphere. Forth went the decree: let Norfolk Island be abandoned and let its people—officers, guards, property-holders and convicts—be transferred to Hobart Town, where Lieutenant-Governor David Collins would dispose of them as directed by despatches from London. The evacuation process went on over a period of eight or nine years. By 1813 the Island was empty.

Deserted and forgotten until 1825 Norfolk Island served mainly as a port of call for warships and distressed sailing vessels. Then life suddenly appeared once more when the sea-girt fourteen square miles of land was resumed for the exile of felons condemned to expiate repeated misdemeanours. As if by magic there sprang into being three centres of enforced industry and ceaseless discontent. The 'Settlement' was made up of official residences, barracks, workshops, cells and store-houses. At the 'Cascades' useful men no longer subject to closest custody were quartered in huts, 20 to 24 men in each. The agricultural department directed its operations from 'Longridge'. In every corner, day and night, lurked menace, despair and fear. None there was to utter, none expected, a word of comfort. Villainy and its retribution furnished more than sufficient material for comment and conversation.

Just about the period of Bishop Willson's election to the See of Hobart, civil authority over Norfolk Island, hitherto administered by New South Wales, was transferred to the Government of Van Diemen's Land. At the same time the spiritual care of the prisoners was given to the Bishop as Dr. Polding's Vicar-General. Men carried off to the dungeon-island were henceforth either brought direct from England or taken there for crimes committed while still serving sentences in the penal stations of Van Diemen's Land. Ships touched at the den of iniquity only to unload or to take aboard cargoes of human misery and depravity. Anxiety to succour these misguided and unfortunate men brought to light the Bishop's boundless charity, missionary ardour, and unselfish devotion; to soothe their bitterness he conquered the most heart-breaking obstacles; amongst them and through them he won an imperishable crown.

It was in May, 1846, that Dr. Willson saw and examined Norfolk Island for the first time. "Although the distance is considerable", he writes to the Lieutenant Governor in applying for permission to undertake the voyage, "and consequently the time required for such a visit proportionately long still it appears to me an important and sacred duty

occasionally to visit that portion of our unfortunate fellow-beings who have a claim on my spiritual solicitude". Patiently and conscientiously 'the prisoners' friend' set to work, weighing all evidence, studying every source of information before forming a judgment. What was the result? "I found on Norfolk Island", said Dr. Willson, "a number of cells ten feet deep, seven feet long, and five feet wide, like cellars beneath the surface of the floor. These dungeon-like places were used as solitary cells, the prisoners being let down through a trap-door". There was worse to come, and Dr. Ullathorne tells some of the awful story in his account of the Bishop:

"He found there the torture of the spread-eagle by which men were spread out by arms and legs and hung up to a wall. He found the torture of the tobacco track. This consisted in constables or other officers seizing a man by the throat and examining his tongue to see if there was the slightest trace of tobacco; the convicts were not allowed to use tobacco at work, and if the slightest trace of it was found, the unfortunate convict, without judge or jury, was punished by twenty-five lashes on the spot. There he found the Tube Gag, an instrument of torture by which men were punished for the crime of speech. A tube was inserted into the mouth, and a strap with which it was connected was buckled behind the head. When he came upon a man punished in that way it was no unusual thing to see froth and blood collected on his lips. Then there was the punishment of the lamp-post in which men were tied to a post. Another system of torture was similar to the 'scavenger's daughter', by which many members of the faith were tortured in England in years past—the heads of men were bent down to their knees and they were tied fast in that position of torture. When Dr. Willson went to Norfolk Island he found a considerable number of men suffering thus. He went round and investigated and threw himself on the side of humanity".

The presence of the Bishop inspired confidence: his sense of justice, together with a scrupulous search for facts, encouraged the best amongst the military and the overseers to express their mind. "The major who commanded the troops", says Dr. Willson, "was so appalled at the state of things on that fair but polluted spot, that, throwing up his hands, he exclaimed: 'For God's sake go home and let them know the truth'." The Bishop decided to follow this advice, a decision which delighted his own flock, and all the leading citizens of Hobart. Robert Pitcairn, representing the legal profession, expressed the thoughts and sentiments of the worthy elements in the community:—

"I have recently learned with great gratification that it is your intention to proceed to England within a short period for the purpose of representing to the Home Government the present miserable state of the convicts in this Colony and at Norfolk Island, and of using your influence and exertions to remedy the evils occasioned by the system as now in force.

"The condition of the convicts—the unheard of crimes of which they are compelled to be witnesses, and sometimes, there is reason to believe compelled to be participators, call on all to exert themselves for the protection of these unhappy men. But what has hitherto been lacking in the attempts that have been made on their behalf has been full and authentic information to the Home Government of the sad results of the present system. There is a natural and not uncommon reluctance to believe such a frightful mass of misery and depravity can exist on the earth—and a difficulty in believing that it has been created, and is hourly increasing by the express authority of English law. But so it is, nevertheless. As the criminal law of England is now administered, a criminal is confined to the society of other criminals, and from this and this alone has arisen all the evil to which I have adverted. We cannot doubt the Government will not hesitate an instant to apply a remedy the moment they are made fully aware of the result, the unavoidable result of the present transportation system.

"From Your Lordship's residence in this Colony and your recent visit to Norfolk Island, and from your profession as a Catholic clergyman you have had ample opportunity of becoming acquainted with the effect and the cause of this moral pestilence. From your rank and position, and perhaps also from your having abstained from any interference in local politics, your testimony will derive a degree of authority which can neither be disputed nor appealed from—and I have therefore the most sanguine hope that your personal representations in England will be enough to put an end at once to a system which is an absolute outrage upon humanity.

"I have taken the liberty of thus writing to Your Lordship from the deep interest which I feel in the object of your voyage; and also because I am sure you will not think me guilty of any improper interference with your sacred duty either by what I have already said, or by my now expressing my most ardent desire that your mission may be successful".¹

Off to England went the Bishop early in September, 1846, travel-

¹*Willson Papers.*

ling at his own expense. Called to give evidence before a committee of the House of Lords he told a tragic tale making an indelible impression on men who for the first time were permitted to know and to realise the nature and enormity of atrocities perpetrated under the British flag.² Questions were asked and information given on every detail of punishments, of discipline, and morality. What was the result of the kind prelate's intervention? Promptly orders were issued to have the 'prison-graves abandoned and filled up', and plans were devised to bring about a general amelioration of conditions at Norfolk Island. Reform, moral and social, was to be regarded in future as the ruling motive of all penal legislation.

Naturally the Bishop of Hobart was pleased with the success so far achieved:

"It is with great gratification", he wrote, "that I reflect on the manner my representations were received by Her Majesty's Government. I have reason to believe that the convict department generally received considerable benefit from my voyage. The evidence I gave before a Committee of the House of Lords (see *Blue Book*, 21st June, 1847) will give ample proof of the wisdom of Major Harold in pressing on me the propriety of taking even a voyage so long and so fatiguing".

After an absence of eighteen months, Dr. Willson was joyfully welcomed back by his Hobart congregation on 19th April, 1848. The colonists of every denomination assembled to voice their sincere appreciation of the services rendered to the whole community by the Catholic Bishop. "We beg", they said in a public address, "to embrace this opportunity of expressing our gratitude for the intense anxiety you have shown whilst in Europe to ameliorate the condition of those who are in bondage; and hope sincerely that your representations to those in high power will conduce materially to guide them in framing such measures as will be free from many of the defects which have existed in the system of transportation as heretofore carried out in this colony, and in Norfolk Island, and be productive of such effects as all good men could wish".³

Dr. Willson did not rest content with exposing evils and making recommendations: he was determined to see the new order established. He knew how easily regulations could be ignored by callous officials so far removed from the vigilant superintendence of higher authorities. To

²*Blue Book*, 21-6-1847.

³Numerous addresses presented to Dr. Willson are in Hobart Archives.

see things for himself he was on the Island again in October, 1849. He noticed a wonderful improvement due, in great measure, to the fact that many of his suggestions regarding housing, discipline and spiritual influences had been carried into effect. "I bless God", he said, "a marvellous change has taken place since my former visit". To the improvement in buildings used as dormitories the "beneficial change" could be attributed. Revolting immoralities and crimes which, in earlier days, had debased human beings were now totally unknown. Not in vain had been the journey to England. In the course of his *Report* forwarded to Sir William Denison after this second survey of Norfolk Island, the Bishop noted with genuine satisfaction :

"The discontinuance of the disgraceful building, the old gaol, and the erection of 124 efficient and well ventilated cells in the new one, have also, no doubt, assist powerfully in the change. Now I find the odious, and worse than useless, lash rarely used, if not entirely discontinued: and solitude combined with judicious moral instruction and counsel by zealous and prudent clergymen, substituted. Too much importance cannot be attached, in my humble judgment, to this part of convict discipline. I would also mention another arrangement that gave me heartfelt pleasure. I mean the evening schools. It had been found both in Norfolk Island and in Van Diemen's Land that more mischief arose during the two or three hours (the time varying with the seasons of the year) which intervene between the hour of ceasing the day's labour and that of retiring to rest than any other part of the day. Now the difficulty is entirely surmounted, and something, I trust, which will prove permanently beneficial, substituted, by the establishment of two well arranged schools, one for Protestants and the other for Roman Catholics. I found the schools conducted by two well-informed schoolmasters⁴ (free men, of course), the convicts divided into classes according to their capacity or amount of knowledge sitting, comparatively at least, in comfort and engaged in various pursuits. They appeared to be quite divested of that spirit of discontent and sullen doggedness so evident formerly. The effect this humane and wise system has produced on some men who were formerly a terror to the place is great beyond conception. By this arrangement a most favourable opportunity is open to the Chaplains to afford a few words of counsel and advice as occasion may require to those who have been occupied on the works during the day, and also of evincing their anxiety for the welfare and amelioration of

⁴Catholic teacher was a Mr. Burke.

these unfortunate men.... I have great pleasure in stating the satisfaction, nay, I might say, edification, I experienced in finding the perfect unanimity which existed among the whole staff—officers on the island, whether civil or military, lay or clerical. How different in 1846!”

Though there was much to merit commendation in the condition of Norfolk Island, at the end of 1849, yet the Bishop deemed it well to sound a note of warning. He predicted a recurrence of former depravity and disorder should the Government fail to introduce preventative measures at once. In particular, Dr. Willson emphasised these points:⁵

- “1.) I have still to deplore the employment of convicts as constables, overseers, etc. The practice I believe to be an evil of very great magnitude; and one, as long as it exists in any penal establishment, almost fatal to that change of conduct so earnestly to be desired.
- “2.) I am of opinion also that the cumulative process of extension on all sentences given for petty breaches of discipline, in general on the words of a convict constable or overseer, to be another evil of great magnitude. By this system hope becomes destroyed, and the prospect of many men striving to regain liberty in a creditable manner dashed, and servitude prolonged beyond all reasonable bounds so that that which is misnamed discipline becomes a practice of unwise, nay, vicious irritation. I would draw your attention to this subject.
- “3.) And lastly, I must again record my regret that this ultimate penal settlement should be 1400 miles from its seat of Government. Now...there is little reason to fear that abuses to any extent could exist; still, from its immense distance from the seat of Government and comparatively infrequent and irregular visitations, it is not difficult to imagine circumstances occurring from which evils of a fearful description might arise and exist for a considerable time before a remedy could be applied....”

Commissioned by the Lieutenant-Governor to investigate matters raised by Bishop Willson, the Comptroller-General⁶ went to Norfolk Island in March, 1850. In general terms he, too, issued a favourable verdict: “Corporal punishment is seldom inflicted: not a man was

⁵*Tas. Gov. Records.*

⁶John Hampton.

flogged while I was on the Island (upwards of one month) nor was any offence detected which required two magistrates for the trial of the offender; and the new cells being now complete, but few cases can arise in which flogging will be necessary, the more especially that through the agency of the task-work system, and general improvement of the buildings, minor punishments may be increased in number and varied in character". Unfortunately, on the main questions the opinions of the pompous official were in direct opposition to those of the Bishop: a fact carefully concealed from Dr. Willson. What happened? Just what had been foretold. Norfolk Island soon reached the lowest depths of its unsavoury history.

Rumours reaching Hobart were causing grievous anxiety to philanthropists and Christian reformers. Had all the good Bishop's toil, and suffering, and charity, and endurance been rendered of no avail by heartless men, resenting criticism and condemnation of their diabolical cruelty? Not if Dr. Willson could prevent it. He did not hesitate to do his duty—a duty painful, laborious, and exhausting. In March, 1852, he set out on his third dreary voyage to Norfolk Island in a prison-ship carrying seventy unhappy and outraged human beings. On this occasion the Comptroller-General was a passenger. "This was fortunate", says the Bishop, "because it afforded Mr. Hampton, as well as myself, an opportunity then of ascertaining the actual state of the discipline and condition of the convicts, and whether the hopes he had entertained [as recorded after his experience in 1850] had been realised or not".

Before leaving Hobart for the Island the Bishop got the Comptroller-General's assurance that the records should be made available to him, and that there would be no hindrance to freedom of investigation. This pledge was not honoured. On the contrary, every effort was made to conceal papers and figures that would be of assistance to an unprejudiced inquirer. In spite of this, Dr. Willson uncovered enough to justify the scathing and horrifying *Report*⁷ which called for the total abolition of that vile prison-island of the Pacific Ocean.

What were the Bishop's feelings? "It is with deep regret", he said, "that I now feel compelled to declare the heartfelt sorrow I experienced, at the state in which I found the convicts. Gloom, sullen despondency, despair of leaving the Island, seemed to be the general condition of the men's mind, except those who were employed as servants or engaged in billets; servants and men in billets, if well conducted, are allowed

⁷Full Report in *Tas. Gov. Rec.*

credit by the task-work system, and to them this credit is most encouraging, as well it may be; but with all the rest it seemed to be totally disregarded. I was shocked, but am not surprised to find so little value set upon it. My hopes of finding extensive benefit from the task system, which has generally worked so well in Van Diemen's Land, were, therefore, completely dashed.... Nearly every man I conversed with conjured me to procure an examination of the Records and judge for myself if the terrible punishments which had been administered had not been inflicted chiefly for mere breaches of discipline, and very many of them of a very minor character; they also added frequently, on the sole word of a convict spy, or a convict constable".

It was in the nature of things that the Bishop should come into close contact with the Catholic prisoners. They were assembled, at his request, for Divine Service. His comment is this: "I declare conscientiously that during my eight years' daily intercourse with convicts I have never felt such difficulty as I did in addressing those who were assembled in that Church the Sunday I was on the Island. On Sunday, 14th March [1852], out of 270 who attended the Church when I officiated, only 52 were without chains..."

"Complaints regarding the frequency of the lash were great, indeed on the Monday previous to our arrival thirty-nine men belonging to the *Settlement* had been flogged, and fourteen from *Longridge Station* next day".

The Bishop recognised the value of the Chaplains' services, and the evil consequences of the reduction in their numbers:

"I cannot omit expressing to Your Excellency⁸ my deep regret that it was deemed expedient in 1850 to discontinue two of the Chaplains employed on Norfolk Island. Economy, I am aware, was the plea for enforcing the measure; but whatever may have been the cause of what follows, certain it is that flagellations were increased in number after the decrease of ministers of religion; and I fear, in the long run, will prove much more expensive to Her Majesty's Government than good and zealous men who labour incessantly for the welfare of the most miserable of the human race. On Norfolk Island every man's hand is raised against the prisoner, except his pastor's. He alone can speak to him the sweet words of compassion. His pastor is his only friend. The reasons which I took the liberty of stating to Your Excellency, in my letter, 7th January, 1850, when praying that two Roman Catholic

⁸Sir W. Denison.

Chaplains might be retained, not only remain unshaken, but, as things have turned out since that period, have been much strengthened, and in support of this, I need only state, that I have with great inconvenience allowed two Roman Catholic Chaplains to reside on the Island, who receive only the stipend of one, and the personal ration of one".

Other details of the grim picture sketched by Bishop Willson must here be omitted. Enough has been written to justify his long struggle against the spirits of wickedness in high places. Surely he must have heard from his Saviour's lips, when his time came to stand before the judgment seat: "I was in prison and you visited me". We behold a distinguished and holy spiritual ruler going aside from a flock presenting the normal problems to be met by any pioneer Bishop, and choosing one offering few attractions or consolations—suspicious, ungrateful, unstable, quick to resent imaginary wrongs, slow to respond to the voice of a true friend and a loving pastor. To such he gave his time, his affections, and, it may be truly said, his life.

In a letter to Dr. Davis, Bishop of Maitland, and Auxiliary to Archbishop Polding, the Hobart Prelate said: "I am making a vigorous effort by letter of 48, yes 48, mortal pages to induce Her Majesty's Government to abandon Norfolk Island as soon as possible. They cannot resist the facts laid before them. I will not rest until it be done". The man⁹ primarily responsible for the evils complained of knew that the Bishop would send a Report to the Lieutenant-Governor of Van Diemen's Land, and through him, to the Imperial Government. Meeting the visitor one night in a prison corridor this petty tyrant said: "Bishop Willson, I am sorry to see you carried away by the stories of these men: you know what a miserable lot they are. Do not permit their stories to make any impression on you". The good-hearted shepherd of souls grew intensely indignant. "What", he replied, "do you know that I am a Catholic Bishop. And do you dare to call me to order for the discharge of my duty? When I was last in England¹⁰ I told the Government to take away one-third of the convicts on this Island: and now I will recommend them to take the whole of the men away".

Norfolk Island, long 'the dwelling place of demons in human shape' was doomed. The Lieutenant-Governor, Sir William Denison, on reading the hideous Report and "on being thus informed as to the true state of affairs, early in 1852, at once resolved upon advising the Imperial

⁹John Price.

¹⁰1846-7.

Government to relinquish the Island as a penal settlement altogether". And so, Bishop Willson had won a noble victory for humanity and for Christ, whose image he saw in every victim of sin and of social injustice. Many prisoners got a remission of the unexpired term of their sentences; some were transferred to other colonies with tickets-of-leave; some, for the most part physical or mental wrecks, were taken to Port Arthur on Tasman's Peninsula in Van Diemen's Land: these last said adieu to Norfolk Island in the beginning of 1855.

JOHN H. CULLEN.

*

*

*

*

SHORT NOTICE

THE FURROW, Vol. I, No. I. St. Patrick's College, Maynooth. PP. 58. 1/6. Annual Subscription, £1.

This new magazine, edited by Rev. J. G. McGarry, of Maynooth College, plans to give a full treatment of many pastoral duties—"preaching, pastoral organisations, the liturgy, the church, its arts and architecture". Theory will be controlled and made alive by contributions of those who are on the spot and doing the actual work. In particular the review will have a special reverence for the traditions of the Irish Church. The Archbishop of Armagh sends *The Furrow* off on what we hope will be its long life. His Grace in a very telling article has some remarks on art and its place in the Church. He laments the divorce between the artist and the Church. Some six articles follow including the following: *Talking of Churches* (by an architect); *A Rural Confraternity*; *Formulae Hiberni Orantis*. Dr. McGarry contributes a generous number of pages to *Notes on the Sunday Gospels* in a fresh and simple manner, most useful, it would seem, for the preacher, who has to deal with an average audience. Finally, there is a very good section entitled *Books and Reviews*. *The Furrow* is directed to the young clergy (because of their enthusiasm), and it should have a growing appeal. Those who wish to subscribe should do so to the Secretary, *The Furrow*, Maynooth, Co. Kildare.

T.V.

Moral Theology & Canon Law

VALIDITY OF BAPTISM CONFERRED IN CERTAIN PROTESTANT SECTS—REPLY OF HOLY OFFICE.

In judging many matrimonial cases the vital consideration of law or of fact is the validity of some Protestant baptisms. For this reason a recent decision of the Holy Office concerning the validity of baptism administered in certain Protestant sects is of great importance. (*A.C. Record*, April, 1950, page 101). Prompted, no doubt, by recent controversy on the subject, certain Ordinaries of the United States proposed this question:

“Whether in making decisions in matrimonial causes, baptism conferred in the sects of the Disciples of Christ, of Presbyterians, of Congregationalists, of Baptists, of Methodists, when necessary matter and form have been used, is still to be presumed invalid on account of defect of intention required in the minister—the intention of doing what the Church does or what Christ instituted; or is the baptism to be presumed valid, unless the contrary is proved in a particular case?”

The reply of the Holy Office, approved by His Holiness, was:

“No, to the first part; Yes, to the second part”.

* * * *

MINISTER OF BAPTISM—CONDITIONS FOR VALIDITY.

On the part of the minister of baptism three elements must be verified for validity—the required matter, the prescribed form, the intention of doing what the Church does or what Christ instituted. When a minister observes the correct matter and form, he is presumed to have the correct intention.

Applying these principles, the Church has held constantly that unbelievers and heretics may baptize validly, provided that they employ the requisite matter and form. Ignorance of the nature of the sacramental effects of baptism, or unbelief in regard to them, does not necessarily exclude a correct intention; for an unbeliever may well intend to do what the Church does, while not understanding or, perhaps, rejecting the Church's claims. While dissociating himself from the Church and her doctrines he may associate himself implicitly with the action of the Church in conferring baptism. Thus, a Jewish doctor or nurse may baptize validly an infant, acting upon the wishes of the parents.

Likewise a heretic, while rejecting the Church's authority and some

of her doctrines, may intend implicitly to do what the Church does or, alternatively, what Christ instituted. Frequently, of course, he will intend the sacramental effect of baptism. On the other hand, he may disavow its sacramental nature and profess some erroneous doctrine regarding baptism itself. The present decree applies to such cases.

Thus, for instance, Baptists deny that a spiritual re-birth is effected by the actual rite of baptism. For them, baptism is a symbol of a certain regeneration which already has taken place in the soul. Therefore, a person is constituted as a member of the Church, not by the rite of baptism, but by the personal experience of having been converted, of having received the grace of Christ. Baptism, therefore, is a visible and external sign that the member has become already a member of the invisible and spiritual Church of Christ. It is a logical consequence of this teaching to reject infant baptism. There are other Protestant sects which profess a similar doctrine as to the nature of baptism.

In recent times a theory has been proposed that baptism administered in these sects should be presumed invalid for purposes of marriage cases. It has been argued that if baptism is administered under a ritual which is formally or equivalently heretical, then the minister's intention must be presumed to be in accordance with the ritual. Therefore, unless it be established that the minister formulated a correct intention, contrary to the profession of the ritual, the baptism should be presumed invalid. On the other hand, it may be argued that, even in such cases, the minister's predominating intention would be, ordinarily, to do what Christ instituted; so that a Baptist minister who uses the prescribed matter and form should be presumed to have the required intention, until the contrary is proved. It is this doctrine which is upheld in the decision of the Holy Office.

To explain this position, a clear distinction should be made between *error*, which is in the *intellect*, and intention, which is an act of the will. An heretical minister may subscribe to erroneous doctrine concerning the nature and effects of baptism, while his predominating intention, at least implicit, is to do what Christ instituted. His case is parallel with that of a party to a marriage who believes in the validity of civil divorce in certain circumstances, but who does not necessarily exclude indissolubility from the contract. While holding an erroneous opinion, his predominating intention may be to contract Christian marriage. In the absence of proof that he elicited a positive act of the will to exclude indissolubility, he is presumed to have intended Christian marriage.

Likewise, the heretical minister is presumed to have intended Christian baptism, unless it is proved that he positively excluded spiritual regeneration as the effect of the baptismal rite.

It should be noted carefully that the reply concerns marriage cases. It has no direct bearing on the question of conditional baptism for converts from the sects named. Thus, a convert from the Baptist sect may be baptized conditionally in order to ensure the valid reception of this necessary means to salvation. At the same time, his Baptist baptism may be presumed to have been valid when the validity of his marriage is in question.

*

*

*

*

LEGITIMACY AND LEGITIMATION IN CANON LAW.

Dear Rev. Sir,

This query concerns a boy who is a prospective seminarian and my purpose is to anticipate a difficulty. I fear that he is illegitimate canonically, as his parents' marriage was invalid in the first place and was rectified some years after this boy was born. Originally they were married in a Registry, but I understand that there was some obstacle to a true marriage, probably a previous bond. The whole affair has been kept secret and questions may produce a delicate situation. Therefore, I should like to know just what enquiries I must make to ascertain whether the boy is to be considered as legitimate and, consequently, whether he is eligible for admission to the seminary.

PRESBYTER.

REPLY.

To answer our correspondent it will be necessary, firstly, to define the canonical notions of legitimacy and legitimation; secondly, to apply them in the case submitted.

LEGITIMACY IN CANON LAW.

Those children are legitimate in canon law who are conceived or born of a valid or a putative marriage, an exception being made in the case of certain sacrilegious offspring. (Canon 1114). This notion is wider than that of natural legitimacy. A child is legitimate canonically when *born* of a valid or a putative marriage, even though conception occurred before marriage. Such offspring is the issue of illicit relationship but, provided the parents marry before its birth, the law will regard it as though the relationship had been licit, setting aside the legal disabilities attendant upon illegitimacy.

LEGITIMATION IN CANON LAW.

Illegitimate offspring is legitimated in various ways—by subsequent marriage of the parents (Can. 1116), by dispensation from some diriment impediment (Can. 1051), by "*Sanatio in radice*" of the marriage, by papal rescript.

As in the case of offspring conceived before a marriage but born subsequently, the process of law is simply a positive disposition of the legislator that the disabilities consequent upon illegitimacy are removed by the various methods enumerated above.

(1) By *subsequent marriage* of the parents, whether valid or putative, whether contracted newly or by way of convalidation, and regardless of whether the marriage is consummated, offspring is legitimated, *provided* that the parents were eligible to contract marriage with one another at the time of its conception or during pregnancy or at the time of birth. This exception should be noted. If parents are prevented from marrying by the existence of some diriment impediment, e.g., previous bond, during the whole period from conception to birth, subsequent marriage does not by itself effect legitimation.

(2) *Dispensation* granted from some diriment impediment (provided that the grant is made in virtue of ordinary jurisdiction, or of jurisdiction delegated by way of a general indult, not, however, if the grant is made by way of rescript in individual cases) includes ipso facto legitimation of offspring already conceived or born of those to whom the dispensation is granted, exception being made in the case of adulterous or sacrilegious offspring. (Can. 1051). In virtue of this provision, legitimation will be effected in some cases not covered by the canon concerning subsequent marriage. For instance, if the diriment impediment of disparity of cult exists between the parents at the time of the conception and birth of the offspring, subsequent marriage will not effect legitimation, even though the impediment has ceased in the meantime by the conversion of the unbaptized party. However, if a dispensation from disparity of cult should be granted with a view to marriage or convalidation, legitimation would be effected, as the dispensing power exercised by an Ordinary in Australia will be power delegated by way of a general indult. Nevertheless, just as in the case of subsequent marriage, exception is made in the case of adulterous offspring.

(3) The legitimation effected by a "*Sanatio in radice*" is complete in regard to canonical effects and applies to all the offspring without

had been given by the parents. However, a "Sanatio in radice" is not granted in the case of a marriage which was contracted with an impediment of the natural or divine law, even though the impediment should have ceased to exist (Can. 1139). Therefore, if at the time of these parties' civil marriage, one of them was bound by a previous bond, there could not have been any question of the marriage having been convalidated by way of "Sanatio in radice".

Applying these notions in the case submitted above, it appears that PRESBYTER should investigate firstly, the circumstances of the convalidation, in order to ascertain whether a dispensation was granted from some diriment impediment, and *secondly*, the eligibility to marry of the parents during the period of this boy's conception, pregnancy and birth. If, as he suggests, they were debarred from marrying at that time by the existence of a previous bond, it would appear that the impediment must have ceased by the death of the previous partner, so that canonical marriage then became possible. In that case, the offspring is adulterous and legitimation has not been effected either by the subsequent marriage or by dispensation from a diriment impediment.

If, on the other hand, they had been debarred from marrying by the existence of some impediment of ecclesiastical law, e.g., consanguinity, disparity of cult, and it was a dispensation from the impediment which enabled their union to be convalidated, then legitimation has been effected through that dispensation, but not by the subsequent marriage. Likewise, if such a marriage had been convalidated by a "Sanatio in radice", the offspring would be rendered legitimate by legal fiction.

It may be opportune to remind our correspondent that he should not dismiss the boy's application at once if the investigation reveals canonical illegitimacy. It is true that illegitimates are excluded from entering the seminary (Can. 1363, 1), also that they are declared irregular "ex defectu" for orders (Can. 984, 1). However, it may be possible to obtain a dispensation from both prohibitions, especially when such close secrecy has been maintained. The matter should be referred to the Ordinary.

*

*

*

*

MARRIAGES PERFORMED BY PASTOR IN ANOTHER PARISH CHURCH.

Dear Rev. Sir,

I have been given the charge of a new parochial district which

consists mainly of temporary buildings, formerly used by service personnel. The building which serves for both church and school is also a converted military hut. Many of the residents are reluctant to be married in these unattractive surroundings and I appreciate the reasonableness of their attitude. The pastor of the nearby parish church has offered graciously to put his church at our disposal for marriages and has invited me to celebrate the marriage in all such cases. It would seem that I must obtain delegation from him to perform each marriage. Is this correct? Also, what is your advice as to the recording of these marriages? Should it be done in my parish register or in my neighbour's?

PAROCHUS NOVUS.

REPLY.

1. There can be no doubt that an express delegation by the neighbouring pastor is required for each marriage; otherwise the marriage is invalid, even if both parties are subjects of the pastor who performs the marriage.

The terms of the canons leave no room for doubt.

Canon 1095, 1.—The pastor and the Local Ordinary validly assist at a marriage only within the limits of their own territory; in which they may validly assist at marriages not only of their own subjects, but also of those who are not their subjects.

2. The pastor and the Local Ordinary who can assist validly at a marriage can also grant to another priest permission to assist at a marriage within the limits of their own territory.

Canon 1096—The permission to assist at a marriage, granted in accordance with Canon 1095, 2, must be given expressly to a certain priest for a certain determinate marriage, all general delegations being excluded except in the case of curates (*vicarii co-operatores*) for the parish to which they are attached.

It is simply a matter of applying these principles to establish that our correspondent requires an express delegation for each marriage performed in his neighbour's church. As he is not a curate in his neighbour's parish, he is not eligible to receive a general delegation.

2. The requirement of law is that a marriage must be recorded in the register of the parish where the marriage takes place. In fact it is the responsibility of the pastor of that place to see that the entry is made. (Canon 1103). Similarly, it is his responsibility to see that the appropriate entry is made in the register of Baptisms in the places of Baptism of the parties.

It would seem advisable that a record should be kept in the register of the new parish as well, although this is not required by law. Probably, permanent residences will replace the temporary buildings and there will be permanent church buildings as well. In years to come it may be helpful to have records of these marriages which would have been celebrated in the parish but for the temporary disabilities.

* * * *

PAULINE PRIVILEGE AND NON-CATHOLICS.

Dear Rev. Sir,

I have a married man under instruction and I wish to clarify his status in regard to marriage. He has never been baptized. Some years ago he married an unbaptized woman. The marriage was a failure and a civil divorce was obtained. Subsequently the divorced wife became a member of the Methodist sect, being baptized in the Methodist Church, and married another baptized member of the same church. I am wondering whether the Pauline Privilege might have applied in her case. If it did, I assume my convert is free to marry.

A further difficulty has been raised by a clerical friend. He claims that the parties, or at least one of them, cancelled matrimonial consent by seeking or by acquiescing in a divorce. As a consequence, the subsequent reception of Baptism by the parties cannot be related to their marriage and, therefore, it can have no bearing on the question of my convert's freedom to marry.

PRESBYTER.

REPLY.

We shall take it as established that both parties were unbaptized at the time of the marriage; also, that the marriage was a valid, natural bond.

PAULINE PRIVILEGE AND HERETICS.

The first question is whether the Pauline Privilege might have been applied in favour of the convert to Methodism, so that the prospective Catholic convert would be free to marry even prior to his conversion. Three difficulties should be considered.

Firstly, there is question of the validity of Methodist Baptism. Here there is immediate scope for applying the decision of the Holy Office discussed in this issue of the *A.C. Record*. In the absence of positive evidence that the minister deliberately excluded the intention required for validity, the use of correct matter and form gives rise to a presumption that the Baptism is valid.

Secondly, a difficulty of a factual nature concerns the interpellations. These are required for the valid use of the Pauline Privilege unless a dispensation has been obtained (Can. 1121, 1122). However, interpellations made privately by a converted party are valid; they are also lawful when it is not possible to carry out the form prescribed in the canons. In such a case they need to be capable of proof in the external forum by the testimony of at least two witnesses or by some other equivalent method of proof. (Can. 1122, 2).

In the case of the Methodist convert, the possibility of a dispensation may be dismissed, as the only authority competent to dispense is the Holy See or some authority delegated by the Holy See. It is not impossible that the interpellations were made privately and that proof is available in the external forum. More probably it will be impossible to establish that any approach was made by the Methodist convert to her ex-husband.

Thirdly, there is the more basic difficulty as to whether a convert to heresy is eligible for the benefits of Pauline Privilege. In other words, is the basis of this privilege valid baptism or Catholic faith and membership of the true church? The question is controverted and such an authority as Gasparri would uphold the more restrictive application. However, the majority of canonists defends the view that valid baptism, even in an heretical sect, is the basis of the privilege. There is no authoritative ruling on the subject. It was examined by the Holy Office in 1859, but the matter was deferred for decision. Authors are unable to advance private replies in favour of either opinion except for a single instance in which, it is claimed, the applicability of the privilege was upheld.

In view of this state of the question it may be held safely that the convert to Methodism was eligible to avail herself of the Pauline Privilege; but the difficulty concerning interpellations is not easily removed.

If it results from an investigation that the Pauline Privilege was not applied in the case of the divorced wife, it will remain for the prospective husband, after being baptized, to petition the Holy Father for a dissolution of his marriage as "*ratum et non consummatum*". It will be necessary to establish that the marriage was non-sacramental originally, that it has become "*ratum*", or sacramental, by the valid reception of baptism by both parties, that it has not been consummated subsequent to the petitioner's baptism and that just causes exist for the Holy Father's granting the favour of a dissolution.

IS CONSENT CANCELLED BY PETITION FOR DIVORCE?

There would seem to be some confusion of cases on the part of our correspondent's clerical friend. For, if consent was given properly in the first place, a valid marriage came into being. Since marriage is indissoluble, it would be impossible for the parties to revoke their consent to the effect of un-making this marriage. Subsequently, both parties are baptized. Independently of their thoughts or desires, their marriage becomes sacramental, because the marriage of baptized persons is a sacrament, whether baptism precedes or follows the marriage.

Perhaps the situation has been confused with the case in which a "Sanatio in radice" is granted. The consent given by the parties must persist in order that a sanatio should be valid. However, in such a case, there was no real marriage from the beginning, although the consent of the parties was naturally valid.

* * * *

CONVALIDATION OF MARRIAGE CONTRACTED IN FEAR.

Dear Rev. Sir,

In performing the routine pastoral visitation I have found a couple, now happily united, whose marriage was brought about by undue pressure on the bride. At the time of the marriage she was quite young. For social and economic considerations her parents wished her to marry this partner and broke down her considerable resistance by threats and cajolery. Contrary to what might have been expected the marriage has proved a happy one. It was in pointing out this unexpected result that the wife and her parents explained these facts to me, the parents accusing themselves, nevertheless, for acting unjustly towards their daughter. I am quite sure of their reliability, and it seems to me that, although they are unaware of the canonical effects of fear, the marriage is surely invalid.

What steps should be taken to convalidate this marriage? It would come as a shock to these people to learn that their marriage is null.

PAULUS.

REPLY.

It may be advisable not to take any steps with a view to convalidation. Despite the certainty of PAULUS it may be recalled that a most difficult decision, even for canonists and judges of experience, is that concerning canonical fear. Pending an official decision, the presumption of law stands in favour of validity. Meanwhile, applying the

well-known principles concerning good faith, it may be concluded reasonably that the parties should be left in their blissful ignorance.

If PAULUS is not satisfied that matters should be left as they stand, he should refer the matter to the Ordinary, who may take the responsibility of directing that the parties be left in good faith, or may grant a "Sanatio in radice", or may decide upon convalidation of the marriage, "ad cautelam", by renewal of consent.

According to the existing law, such renewal of consent would have to be carried out in the prescribed canonical form, for the defect is public in the canonical sense, i.e., capable of proof in the external forum (Can. 1037).

It is in view of the scandal which may arise in such cases of invalidity that some canonists have advocated a modification of the law to provide for some form of automatic convalidation, e.g., by lapse of a certain period of time after the fear has ceased and the parties have lived together without protest. They would seek thus to eliminate the necessity for an explicit renewal of consent. Those who advocate such a measure invoke legislation of previous times in their support.

* * * *

MARRIAGE OF CONSCIENCE OR MARRIAGE IN PRESENCE OF WITNESSES ONLY

Dear Rev. Sir,

While taking census I have found the case of a single Catholic man living with a non-Catholic woman, who is married and not divorced. It transpires that her husband is a Catholic and that they were married in a Registry Office. Legally she is unable to institute divorce proceedings. The present association has become a permanent one, a child has been born and the parties hope to be able to marry. Is there any way of regularising their situation so that they may live as husband and wife in good conscience? I might add that the woman's marriage is quite unknown in the district.

REPLY.

In the first place the case should be referred to the Ordinary for judgment upon the validity of the marriage performed in the Registry Office. It will be a matter of establishing that the absent husband was bound by the law of canonical form and that their union was never convalidated in canon law.

Then there are two possible ways of relieving the present situation.

It will be for the Ordinary to make a choice according to the circumstances.

(1) MARRIAGE OF CONSCIENCE.

The Ordinary may judge that a marriage of conscience should be celebrated, i.e., a marriage without banns and in Secret (Can. 1104). The law states that only for the gravest and most urgent reasons may a marriage of conscience be permitted by the Ordinary (and not by the Vicar General without a special mandate). From such a permission arise grave obligations of secrecy on the part of the priest who assists at the marriage, the witnesses, the Ordinary and his successors, the parties themselves. Such a marriage must be recorded in a special book which is kept in the diocesan secret archives, not in the parochial registers of marriages and of baptisms. (Can. 1104, 1105, 1107).

(2) MARRIAGE IN PRESENCE OF WITNESSES ONLY.

In view of the implications in civil law, the Ordinary may decide that the circumstances envisaged in Canon 1098 are verified, i.e., for a marriage "*coram solis testibus*". According to this canon, in two cases where it is impossible to have or to reach a pastor or Ordinary or delegated priest, who may assist at a marriage in accordance with canonical requirements, marriage may be celebrated in the presence of witnesses only, namely:

(1) In danger of death marriage is valid and licit when celebrated before witnesses alone;

(2) Even outside danger of death, provided that it is prudently foreseen that the aforesaid condition of affairs will last for a month.

From replies given by the Code Commission it is established that the "grave inconvenience" may be of the moral order. The conditions of the canon may be verified if the grave inconvenience is such as to prevent the priest's presence at the marriage even though he is living in the vicinity. Such a grave inconvenience could be the danger of fine or imprisonment and the publicity attendant upon being charged in a public court. In a further reply the Code Commission has decided that the grave inconvenience may be on the part of the parish priest, Ordinary or delegated priest or on the part of the parties. In the case submitted the liability to civil penalties would constitute a "grave *incommodum*" for all parties concerned as, according to civil law, if the woman were to go through the form of marriage without having been divorced, she would be guilty of bigamy.

JAMES CARROLL.

Liturgy

NOTES CONCERNING THE CHURCH AND ITS FURNISHINGS. IV.

LAMPS AND ELECTRIC LIGHTING.

1.—*The Sanctuary Lamp.*

The *Caerimoniale Episcoporum* (Lib. 1, xii, 17) prescribes the use of lamps in the Church, and this not merely for purposes of devotion and ornamentation, but also because of their mystical significance. The number of lamps before each altar should vary according to the importance of the altar, provided that there always be an uneven number of lamps. Hence there ought to be at least five lamps before the altar at which the Blessed Sacrament is reserved, and three lamps before the High Altar, which is presumed to be distinct from the Blessed Sacrament Altar. One lamp may be placed before each of the other altars of the Church. The Code of Canon Law (can. 1271) requires that there should be at least one lamp burning continuously before the Blessed Sacrament. In view of the above prescription concerning the uneven number of the lamps, it is not strictly correct to have two Sanctuary Lamps, but rather one, three, or five should be used.

The choice of the form and the material of the Sanctuary Lamp, and other lamps is left to the discretion of those responsible for the altar-furnishings, but the size and design ought to be in agreement with the architectural style of the edifice.

The use of tinted glass for the container or shade of the Sanctuary Lamp is very general. A red-tinted glass is perhaps the more common, although green-tinted glass is also seen. While the use of such glass is permissible, it seems true to state that a container or shade of clear glass is more correct, and so desirable.

The position of the Sanctuary Lamp calls for some remarks. It is forbidden to place it on or above the altar (S.C.R. 4035-6). Likewise, it may not be placed behind the altar, but 'before' it. The Sanctuary Lamp, then, may be either in the centre of the sanctuary or on one side, care being taken that it is always in front of the altar, and not in a line with, or behind it. It may be suspended from the ceiling of the sanctuary, or fixed in a bracket attached to the wall on one side, or placed on a stand or pedestal.

Olive oil or a bees-wax candle is normally required for the Sanc-

tuary Lamp (can. 1271). The Ordinary may permit the use of other oils when olive oil is not procurable. In such circumstances, vegetable oils are to be preferred to mineral oils. A mixture of olive oil and bees-wax may also be used (S.C.R. 4205). The percentage of bees-wax in the candle, which is substituted for the olive oil lamp, has not been determined. In the absence of any specific instructions from the Ordinary, we may follow, as a practical guide, the regulation which determines the percentage of bees-wax to be used in candles for use at Mass, that is, the candle should be 65% pure bees-wax. When neither olive oil, nor any other oil, nor even a bees-wax candle can be obtained, the Ordinary may allow the use of electricity for the Sanctuary Lamp (S.C.R. 4334). Furthermore, the Formula Maior grants to the Australian Bishops the faculty to allow the Blessed Sacrament to be reserved without any light in places where no suitable substance can be obtained for the Sanctuary Lamp, but this only in case of real necessity, in the determination of which the Ordinary Himself has a grave obligation in conscience (cfr. A.C.R. xviii, 1941, pp. 156 & 197).

2.—*Votive lamps.*

Votive candles may be used on the altar if they are of bees-wax 'in maiore vel notabile quantitate'. Votive lamps may be placed on the altar if oil or bees-wax is used in them. They may not be placed immediately in front of or on top of the tabernacle, nor should they ever be placed on the mensa of the altar during Mass.

3.—*Electric lighting.*

Another matter that requires careful attention is that of the electric lighting of the altar and sanctuary. Concerning the use of electric lights on the altar, the prescriptions of the Congregation of Rites and other authorities are that no electric lights may be used on the altar itself, or on any part of it. This applies even when the prescribed number of candles is already on the altar. Hence it is forbidden:—

- i. To light up the interior of the tabernacle.
- ii. To light up vases of flowers upon the altar of Exposition.
- iii. To light up the exposition throne so as to permit the Blessed Sacrament to be seen by the faithful.
- iv. To place electric lights before relics in place of candles.
- v. To form crowns, rays, or moons around statues by means of electric lights. However, the practice of using electric candles in the candelabra of adoring angels may be permitted, provided that the statues are separated from the altar.

The lighting of the sanctuary must avoid anything that savours of the theatrical. Therefore spotlights and coloured lights ought not to be used. The effect produced should be moderate, and as far as is possible, the sources of the light should be concealed. The same is true of the lighting up of statues and paintings. In a word, the whole effect of the lighting should be in harmony with the sacred character of the Liturgy and the dignity of the House of God.

THE SANCTUARY CARPETS.

The *Caerimoniale Episcoporum* (Lib. 1, xii, 16) prescribes the use of carpets or rugs as a covering for the sanctuary floor on the occasion of greater feasts, and suggests that the colour of the coverings be green. Likewise, the predella and the central part of the altar steps should always be covered. The colour of the carpet is not determined, but green is highly recommended.

The designs on the carpets should avoid the use of profane symbols, as being out of place in a sacred edifice, and on the other hand, sacred figures or monograms should not be used, as it is unbecoming to tread under foot sacred images and emblems. Some authors suggest a rug for the predella, and a woollen carpet for the sanctuary itself. It is advisable to move around the carpets about every six months in order to avoid too much wear in one particular place.

During the Office and Mass for the Dead, all carpets should be removed except the one covering the predella and this should be violet or black in colour. The carpets are also removed from the sanctuary and steps of the altar after the stripping of the altars on Holy Thursday and are replaced on Holy Saturday.

In the next issue we shall consider the Credence Table, Sedilia, Pulpit, Communion Rails, and Sacramentum.

R. F. DONOHOE.

*

*

*

*

QUERIES.

THE PRAYER *FIDELIUM*—BOW TO THE CROSS AFTER THE LAST GOSPEL.

Dear Rev. Sir,

1. The *Ordo* sometimes adds the prayer *Fidelium* to the list of prayers to be said at Mass. When exactly must this prayer be added?

2. After the Celebrant has finished reading the Last Gospel, should he bow to the Cross before going to recite the Prayers after Mass?

ANCEPS.

REPLY.

1. The rubrics which require the addition of the prayer *Fidelium* on certain days are contained in the *Additiones et Variationes in Rubricis Missalis* (Tit. III, 3 & 4). Except during Advent, Lent, and Paschal Time, and during the month of November, on the first day of each month on which the Office is of the Feria, the prayer *Fidelium* is added in all private Masses, which are not Requiem Masses. This prayer is said as the second last of all the prayers, including those which may be added by the Celebrant *ad libitum*, nor does it exclude any of the prayers assigned by the Rubrics according to the Season. If this first free day is a Feria of Quarter Tense, a Vigil, or a day on which the Office of the preceding Sunday must be resumed, then the prayer *Fidelium* is said on the first day afterwards, on which it is not similarly impeded. Moreover, outside of Lent and Paschal Time, on each Monday on which the Office is of the Feria, and which is not a Vigil, and on which the Mass of the preceding Sunday need not be resumed, in all Masses, which are not Requiem Masses, the prayer *Fidelium* is to be added as above. It is to be noted, that when the prayer is prescribed, it must be said even in private Votive Masses, and in Masses in the presence of the Blessed Sacrament (S.R.C. 4235, 5 and 4327, 2).

2. The Missal, of course, makes no provision for the recitation of the Leonine Prayers after Mass, but merely directs the Celebrant, having finished the Last Gospel, to go to the centre of the Altar, to take the Chalice, and to descend to the foot of the altar steps, where he genuflects or bows profoundly, according as the Blessed Sacrament is present on the Altar or not, before proceeding to the Sacristy. The Sacred Congregation of Rites in reply to the question, whether the Priest must bow to the Cross before descending to recite the prescribed prayers after Mass, stated that the bow is neither prescribed nor forbidden (3637, 8). There does not seem to be any good reason why the Celebrant should not go directly, without any bow, to recite the Prayers after Mass. It is also of interest that the above-mentioned decree states that, the Leonine Prayers may be recited while kneeling either on the predella or on the bottom step.

*

*

*

*

ARRANGEMENT OF MYSTERIES OF THE ROSARY FOR DAYS OF THE WEEK.

Dear Rev. Sir,

What authority has the Altar Manual for directing us to say the

Sorrowful Mysteries on Tuesday? If the feast of the Assumption of Our Lady falls on a Tuesday, is it wrong, in public recitation of the the Rosary, to say the Glorious Mysteries?

RUFUS.

REPLY.

The Fathers of the IV Plenary Council of Australia and New Zealand (Dec. 551) decreed that a book should be published containing the forms of prayers commonly recited in English, and that the use of these official forms should be obligatory. They likewise determined that an edition of a *Benedictionale* be prepared for use at liturgical functions. The Official Edition of the 'Altar Manual and *Benedictionale*' compiled by the Committee appointed by the Plenary Council contains the prayers for the recitation of the Rosary. Before the Sorrowful Mysteries, we read the following rubric: 'Usually recited on Tuesdays and Fridays and on Sundays of Lent'. A corresponding rubric appears before the Joyful and Glorious Mysteries. The initial adverb of the rubric seems to indicate that the arrangement of the Mysteries for the various days of the week is a matter of pious custom. Consequently there is no difficulty about reciting the Glorious Mysteries on the feast of the Assumption of Our Lady when it falls on a Tuesday, in fact one might even venture to say that this is the more appropriate thing to do. The origin of the prayers given in the Altar Manual for the recitation of the Rosary was referred to in a previous reply: 'The Bishops of England, for more than fifty years have had an approved "Manual of Prayers for Congregational and home use". In this manual we find the meditations and prayers commonly used among us with a note that they have been popular in England for many generations' (*A.C.R.* xiv, 1937, p. 158). These are substantially the same prayers that have now been incorporated in the Official Edition of the Altar Manual.

*

*

*

*

SUSPENSION OF INDULGENCES DURING HOLY YEAR.

Dear Rev. Sir,

The January number of the *Record* contains a document relating to indulgences during the Holy Year. However, many of us are at sea about the matter, and I should be grateful if you could inform me as to whether a Plenary Indulgence is still attached to the following exercises:—a) Via Crucis; b) Divine Office in the presence of the Blessed Sacrament; c) Holy Rosary in the presence of the Blessed Sacrament; d) the prayer 'En Ego'.

SACERDOS.

REPLY.

The Papal document to which our correspondent refers is that which concerns the suspension of indulgences and Faculties during the Jubilee year 1950 (cfr. *A.C.R.* xxvii, 1950, pp. 1-2). This Apostolic Constitution suspends all indulgences granted for the living, with the exception of seven, which are specifically excluded. Among those which we may still gain for ourselves are: 1) indulgence to be gained at the hour of death; 2) indulgence attached to the recitation of the 'Angelus'; 3) indulgences of the Forty Hours; 4) indulgence attached to the recital of the Pope's prayer for the Holy Year. There has been no suspension of indulgences applicable to the dead. The Code of Canon Law (can. 930) affirms that all indulgences granted by the Roman Pontiff, unless the contrary is evident, are applicable to the souls in Purgatory. The Plenary Indulgence, therefore, attached to the exercises mentioned in the query, may still be gained and applied to the Holy Souls, but we are unable to gain this indulgence for ourselves during the Holy Year.

* * * *

COMMON PROPER NAMES WITH LATIN EQUIVALENTS.

The following list of masculine proper names may be of use when there is question of making out certificates, or of entering names in official books. A list of feminine proper names will be printed in a later issue:—

A		B	
Adolph	Adúlphus	Barnaby	Bárnabas
Adrian	Adriánus (or Hadriánus)	Barry	Finbárrus
Alan	Alánus	Bartholomew	Bartholomaéus
Alban	Albánus	Basil	Basilíus
Albert	Albértus	Bede	Béda
Alexander	Alexánder	Benedict	Benedíctus
Alfred	Alfrédus (or Alaphrídus)	Bernard	Bernárdus
Aloysius	Aloysius	Bertram	Bertrándus
Ambrose	Ambrósíus	Bonaventure	Bonaventúra
Andrew	Andréas	Boniface	Bonifátius
Anselm	Ansélmus	Brendan	Brendánus
Anthony	Antóníus	Brian	Briánus
Arnold	Arnóldus	Brice	Brítius
Arthur	Arthúrus (or Arctúrus)	Bruno	Brúno
Augustine	Augustínus		C
Austin	Augustínus	Canice	Cánicus
		Cecil	Caecílius
		Charles	Cárolus
		Christopher	Christóphorus

	C		H
Clarence	Claréntius	Horace	Horátius
Claude	Claúdius	Hubert	Hubértus
Clement	Clémens	Hugh	Húgo
Colin	Colúmba	Humphrey	Humphrédus
Conrad	Conrádus		I
Cyril	Cyrillus	Ian	Joáannes
	D	Ignatius	Ignátius
Daniel	Dániel	Isidore	Isidórus
David	Dávid		J
Denis	Dionysius	James	Jacóbus
Dominic	Dominicus	Jerome	Hierónymus
Donald	Donáldus	John	Joáannes
	E	Jordan	Jordánus
Edgar	Edgarus	Joseph	Joséphus
Edmund	Edmúndus	Julian	Juliánus
Edward	Eduárdus	Justin	Justinus
Edwin	Edwínus		K
Eric	Éricus	Keiran	Queránus
Ernest	Ernéstus	Kenneth	Cánicus
Eugene	Eugénius	Kevin	Coémgenus
Eustace	Eustáchius		L
	F	Lambert	Lambértus
Felix	Félix	Laurence	Lauréntius
Finbar	Finbárrus	Leo	Léo
Francis	Franciscus	Leonard	Leonárdus
Frederic	Friderícus	Leopold	Leopóldus
	G	Lewis	Ludovícus
Gaspar	Gaspárus	Lionel	Leonéllus
Geoffrey	Godefrídu	Louis	Ludovícus
George	Geórgius	Luke	Lúcas
Gerald	Geráldus		M
Gerard	Gerárdus	Malachy	Malachías
Gilbert	Gilbértus	Marcel	Marcéllus
Giles	Aegídius	Mark	Márcus
Godfrey	Godefrídu	Martin	Martínus
Gregory	Gregórius	Matthew	Matthaéus
Guy	Guído	Maurice	Maurítius
	H	Michael	Míchaël
Harold	Haróldus		N
Henry	Henrícus	Nathaniel	Nathániel
Herbert	Heribértus	Neil	Nigéllus
Herman	Hermánnus	Nicholas	Nicoláüs
Hilary	Hilárius	Noel	Natális
		Norman	Normánnus

O		S	
Oliver	Olivérius	Samuel	Sámuël
Oscar	Anschárius	Sidney	Dionysius
Oswald	Oswáldus	Silvester	Silvéster
		Simon	Simón
P		Stanislaus	Stanisláus
Paschal	Paschális	Stanley	Stanisláus
Patrick	Patrícius	Stephen	Stéphanus
Paul	Paúlus		
Peter	Pétrus	T	
Philip	Philíppus	Terence	Teréntius
		Theodore	Theodórus
Q		Thomas	Thómas
Quentin	Quinctínus	Timothy	Timótheus
		U	
R		Urban	Urbánus
Ralph	Radúlphus		
Raymond	Raymúndus	V	
Reginald	Regináldus	Valentine	Valéntinus
Rex	Rex	Victor	Víctor
Richard	Richárdus	Vincent	Vincéntius
Robert	Robértus		
Roger	Rogérius	W	
Roland	Rolándus	Walter	Gualtérus
Ronald	Ronáldus	Wilfrid	Walfríðus
Roy	Rex	William	Guliélmus
Rupert	Rupértus		
		Xavier	Xavérius

P. MURPHY.

SHORT NOTICE.

THE SPIRIT OF GOD, by C. C. Martindale, S.J. Sheed and Ward. 7/6.

Of the many useful books of sermons published for the convenience of hard working priests one of the most admirable is undoubtedly Father Martindale's *The Spirit of God*. The learned Jesuit needs no introduction to readers of the *Record*. He is well known to be one of the most acute religious thinkers of our times, and his lectures and sermons invariably combine clarity and depth with remarkable eloquence.

The fifteen sermons which comprise this little volume were preached by Father Martindale during the May and the Advent of 1948 at Farm St. Church, and during the Lent of 1949 at St. James's, Spanish Place. The central theme running through them all is the reality of the spiritual in the world and the enduring spiritual conflict of which men—even Catholic men—are so often unconscious. Hence the sermons naturally insist on the spiritual element in man; then, on the angelic world; and finally on the Holy Ghost Himself, Who alone can bring order and life out of chaos. The high standards of the author's many previous works are well maintained, and the treatment throughout is characteristically vigorous and stimulating. Right from the start he attacks modern errors and he delivers his blows with consummate skill and power.

To the priest and the layman alike this little book will be of the greatest value; to the former it will supply abundant matter for solid sermons, while the latter will find in it a most attractive presentation of the Church's doctrine and life.

R.W.

Homiletics

PRAISE OF MARY.

The magnitude of the glory of Mary at the same time compels our praise and defeats it. Since Gabriel's first glorious greeting, Saints and scholars, preachers and poets have vied with one another in extolling her magnificence, and all have known how inadequate were their golden phrases. But the splendour of God's Mother, the tenderness of our Mother impelled them, and impels us, to make such praise as mortals may of "our tainted nature's solitary boast".

Few of the praises composed in Mary's honour excel the simple beauty of the Litany of Loreto, none is dearer to the Catholic heart. This hallowed prayer was first used at the celebrated shrine of the Holy House at Loreto in Italy and has received the endorsement of the Holy See and approbation of the universal Church.

Let us meditate upon some of the beautiful invocations contained therein.

"Mystical Rose, pray for us".

The rose is the poor man's orchid. For most men it is the most beautiful of flowers, combining as it does perfection of form, gorgeous colouring and exquisite perfume. In mystical poetry Mary is envisaged as a rose, the fairest bloom in God's garden. From the first moment that glorious life budded forth, the tender care of the divine Gardener suffered no canker of evil to attack this favoured flower; it unfolded to full glory unmarred, unstained, unscathed by any deformity of sin: its beauty is the fullness of the grace that is in Her. Deep red, rich and glowing is the colour of the Mystical Rose to symbolise that warm heart overflowing with love for God and men; while that breath-taking perfume is Her prayer ascending ever to God for us.

"Tower of David, pray for us".

In ancient days, Kings erected strong towers as impregnable fortresses to protect their dominions against the assault of enemies. To such strongholds their people would flee for protection when danger threatened. Our King, Christ the Son of David, of whom David the King was a type and a prophecy, has raised such a tower as an unshatterable defence for His people. He had given us Mary as our protectress. She is our safeguard and our shield against the onslaught of our deadly foes. To call in faith and trust upon Mary's aid in trial or temp-

tation is to shelter safe behind a bulwark against which the waves of evil may dash themselves in vain. No matter how great the danger, no matter how terrible the enemy, we can never be overwhelmed if we avail ourselves of this bastion set up for our safety by our King.

"Tower of Ivory, pray for us".

But this mighty tower of David is not only constructed in immense strength, it is devised in incomparable beauty. Imagine a great castle, built of the purest, whitest marble, rising up in splendid majesty from the plain. See how the towering walls seem to glow like ivory in the brilliant sunshine; see the high-flung battlements and the soaring turrets shining magnificent with reflected light. So the poetic author of the litany sees this mystical tower glorious in the light of the true Sun, the Word Incarnate. 'Tis from Him that Mary's glory comes, She reflects the Splendour of Her Son. Her immaculate purity, the splendour of Her virtue makes Her mirror the effulgence of the God-head. There She stands in majesty—the Tower of Ivory—our inspiration and our strength.

"House of Gold, pray for us".

Beyond doubt the Grand Canal of Venice is the most beautiful thoroughfare in the world. As his gondola glides smoothly along this waterway, there unfolds before the traveller's gaze a panorama of fairyland beauty. On either side rising from the water's edge in endless variety are castles, churches, and palaces of the most fantastic loveliness. Amongst them is one which by the delightful delicacy of its proportions and the opulence of its adornment might well merit to be considered the most magnificent palace on earth. It is known as the "Ca-d'oro", the "House of Gold". As Venice is not far from Loreto, and as this palace was built about the time our Litany was composed it is not improbable that the "Ca-d'oro" was the inspiration of this invocation of the Litany.

The Apostle reminds us that we are all temples of the Holy Ghost, and Our Lord Himself said that He and the Father would dwell within the souls of His faithful. By His grace God has built Himself many a splendid palace in the souls of His Saints, and they by their virtues have laboured fittingly to adorn the residence of God within them. But never has Our Lord found as fair a dwelling as in the soul of Mary. As Her dignity far surpasses that of all angels and saints, so the splendour of the graces bestowed upon Her and the heroism of the virtues practised by Her exceed beyond measure the grace and virtue of all others.

She is in very truth the throne of God, the most beautiful abode of His Majesty. She is indeed the "House of Gold".

"Ark of the Covenant, pray for us".

The most treasured possession of the Jewish people was the Ark of the Covenant. The ark was a wooden chest plated inside and out with gold, and covered with a golden lid ornamented with two golden statuettes of angels. In it were placed the two stone tablets of the Law, on which God Himself had enscribed the Ten Commandments. These tablets were the emblems of the treaty or covenant which God made with the people of Israel, and hence the treasure-chest was called the Ark of the Covenant. The Ark was kept in the inmost sanctuary of the Tabernacle and above it floated a brilliant cloud by which God manifested His presence amongst His people.

In the fullness of time the types and images of the old Covenant gave way to the realities and glories of the New Testament. No longer by a cloud but in His Own real presence did God manifest Himself to men. Not by a covenant of fear but by a dispensation of love did God bind His people to Himself. Mary is fittingly called the Ark of this new Covenant. In that old testament of shadows and figures of things to come an inanimate thing of wood and gold housed symbols of God's presence with men. In the new and eternal testament the most pure body of the Virgin-Mother was the dwelling of "Emmanuel"—"God-with-us".

"Gate of Heaven, pray for us".

"I am the gate" said Our divine Lord, and it is only through Him that we can enter the Kingdom of God. Only through His redeeming death can we find salvation. But in a two-fold sense Mary, too, can be called the Gate of Heaven. First, since Christ came to us through Mary: for the divine work of the Incarnation was accomplished when the power of the Most High overshadowed Her. And secondly, we go to Christ through Mary. To Her, our Advocate, and our Mother, Our Saviour has committed the distribution of all His grace. Grace is our passport to Heaven, and grace comes to us through Mary. Truly then is She the "Gate of Heaven".

"Morning Star, pray for us".

From time immemorial men have tracked their way across the watery wastes of the sea by observation of the stars. The heavenly bodies, fixed and constant in an ever-changing world, are our safe and

certain guide to harbour. The name "Mary" may be interpreted as "Star", and how appropriately She is called our Star of the Sea, whose kindly light leads us safely and surely home. Of all the splendid orbs that illumine the heavens that surely is the most beautiful that heralds the dawn. Mary's Immaculate Conception was the first glorious portent of the Redemption. She was the Morning Star, the harbinger of the Rising Sun.

May She, who is the Help of Christians, now as often in times past, protect the people of God from the fury of God's enemies. And may She, who is the Refuge of Sinners, pray for us sinners now and at the hour of our death. Amen.

W. H. BAKER.

*

*

*

*

SHORT NOTICE

PAPUAN CONQUEST. The story of the Catholic Missions in Papua, or Australian New Guinea. By F. A. Dupeyrat, M.S.C. 126 pages. Price, 5/6. Araluen Publishing Co., Melbourne.

This account of the coming of Catholic Missionary effort to Papua in 1885, and its subsequent history, merits reading by all Australian Catholics. It is the story of our Church, in our Australian territory; for such Papua became in 1906.

Few books contain the many-sided interest found in this work. Its author, Fr. Dupeyrat, was awarded the "Prix Verriers" by the French Academy for his larger and more comprehensive treatment, "Papouasie. Histoire de la Mission (1885-1935)", and the merit of that book is reflected in the present publication.

Those who want facts on the nature of Papua, of its people, their origin, disposition, and suchlike, will find included here the observations of one who has spent nineteen years in intimate contact with the land and its inhabitants. Two maps and eighty well-chosen, and clearly reproduced photographs are also of much assistance.

Adventure is woven closely into the story. The oath taken by Baiva, head of the Sivu tribe, and its sequel; the conversion of the Tuyuge tribe, are but two instances of the absorbing reading provided.

Enthusiasm is the characteristic of Fr. Dupeyrat's treatment; a zeal for Christ and for souls. It is that effervescent type which contagiously affects the reader; and then gives him something to exercise his new fervour on. The Papuan Mission needs prayers and material assistance, and the writer gives every reason and justification for its receiving them.

We heartily recommend this booklet to all, for few there are who could read it without gain. It is a narrative of great value, written by a priest who capably presents his subject.

M.N.

Notes

Those who have experienced the remarkable qualities of Mgr. Knox's translation of the Old Testament from Genesis to Esther will welcome this second volume, which (with the New Testament already well known to the public) completes the author's nine-years' task of englishing the Bible. The volume before us is a stout tome of 864 pages (pp. 741-1604), published by Burns, Oates and Washbourne, towards the end of last year. It bears the title: *The Old Testament newly translated from the Latin Vulgate by Mgr. Ronald A. Knox at the request of the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster—for private use only—Vol. 2. Job—Machabees*. There is an appendix giving Mgr. Knox's translation of the New Roman Psalter.

A brief notice of this volume, which contains seven didactic books of the Old Testament, eighteen prophetic books, and two historical books must be limited to generalities and to certain impressions with regard to details. The volume (including the two Psalters) takes about fifty hours to read—as one would read a story carefully—and a moderately close critical reading of it would take at least three times that number of hours. Consequently, a scientifically critical judgment will not be expected of us.

As a reader's Bible, there can be hardly any praise too high for Mgr. Knox's version of the Old Testament. His English is prodigious. It has living qualities that draw the reader along a stream of intelligible words, of which one does not easily tire. The Bible, of course, neither can nor should be read with the distracted attention which is given to a newspaper; but here the strain of attention is almost magically diminished by Mgr. Knox. The reader sails on the Nile of the Bible—the metaphor is partially biblical—with an ease which will surprise those who have been used to reading a version like the Douai. The translator never allows his style of rendering to sink into a dull uniformity. The varieties of turn in phrase and sequence, which he commands, are almost incredible. Let someone read Job in the new translation for an hour and see for himself if this is true.

Nevertheless, indiscriminate praise would not be honest praise. There are times when Mgr. Knox does not use the obvious word, and

when this happens, some nuance of meaning is sometimes missed. We have, we think, noted several instances of this. Let one or two suffice. In Job 14: 7 he translates: "Pollarded, it (a tree) still grows green . . ." The ordinary man in the street does not understand "pollard" as an operation on trees and, in any case, the word does not really translate what Job had in mind, and what St. Jerome expressed by the Latin, "praeidere". Similarly in Job 12: 19 "*disseise* the noble" will be understood by few who are not lawyers. The Hebrew simply has: "He overthrows (or casts down) the mighty (literally, the stayers)", which St. Jerome rather freely translated: "*optimates supplantat*". We are not saying that "*disseise*" is wrong, but it is an obscure word, and is needlessly away from the simple sense. Similarly, in the same passage: "He *bemuses* judges" could very well be: "He makes fools of judges".

Knox's Book of Job is a literary masterpiece. He seems also to have been extraordinarily successful in his treatment of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Wisdom, and Ecclesiasticus. Evidently gnomic poetry is into his hands. It is agreeable to see that the praises of the valiant woman, whom he calls (what she is) a vigorous wife, are given to us with an English substitute for the Hebrew alphabetic acrosticism. Knox's eulogy is alphabetic from A to W, instead of from Aleph to Tau. The same has been done for the acrostic Psalms and for the Lamentations of Jeremias.

The Canticle is, we think, not all that it should be. The language is good and quite becoming and sufficiently faithful to the text, but to a tyro we fear that the impression will be one of a jumble of profane love-songs. The notes are confusing, and do not give any sufficient clue to the sacred character of the poem.

So much has been said about the Knoxian Psalter, that we have no desire to add to the unfavourable receptions it received in so many scholarly quarters. We can only admire the good prose of the version and its many felicities, and regret that it is not more like the Hebrew poetry, which was still Hebrew poetry in the Vulgate, and remains Hebrew poetry in our New Latin Psalter.

We have not been able to take enough cognizance of the Prophets to warrant bold speech. From the passages, which we sampled, it is clear that the general surpassing excellence of the translation is unquestionable. All is eminently readable, and there are magnificent renderings of magnificent passages, like the doom of Babylon and the downfall of its Prince in Isaiah, the oracles of restoration in Jeremias,

the dirge over Tyre in Ezechiel. We may register some disappointments, however. The exquisite song of the vineyard in Isaias 5 is wordy prose instead of the nervously curt poetry of Isaiah's fashioning. Similarly, the opening of the Lamentation has lost even the measure of poetic quality which it has in Douai-Challoner. We had some disappointments also in Osee, but the greatest of all was in Malachias. The prophecy of the Mass (1: 11) is badly obscured, and the footnote on the verse is incredibly strange.

The narrative books of Machabees have the fine style which Mgr. Knox showed so conspicuously in the historical books from Josue to Esther. The passage of second Machabees which is so often quoted by Catholics in justification of prayers for the dead is, indeed, well translated, but the substitution of the word "guilt" twice over for "sins" is unfortunate. Seeing that sin has a *reatus culpæ* and a *reatus poenae*, it is not good theological scholarship, in that particular context, to substitute only one aspect of the liability of the fallen Israelites, who had spoiled the temples of Jamnia.

A little bit of cautious feeling that the Knox translation will not always suffice for a theological argument is no harm. But let us say without any misgiving that we wish this Bible the most unlimited circulation. It does for the Holy Scripture what no modern version in English has yet done. It makes the Catholic Bible a book which any reader of English, who can read a *Readers' Digest*, may read with comparative ease. That itself proves that Mgr. Knox as a translator has worked a sort of miracle.

*

*

*

*

We have to take notice also of a small book of a hundred pages on the Pauline doctrine of the Body of Christ, which is the Church. It belongs to the smaller series of *Etudes Bibliques*, the title being: *l'Eglise Corps du Christ d'après Saint Paul. Etude de Théologie Biblique*, par le Chanoine Werner Goossens (Gabalda, Paris, 1949). The author, whose recent death deprives the Great Seminary of Ghent of a brilliant professor, did his work of summarization well. His study runs into three chapters: the first of which marshals the Pauline texts which explicitly mention the subject of the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ; the second is a systematic and synthetic exposition of the doctrinal implications of those passages; the third is dedicated to the question of the origin of St. Paul's conception.

The texts are presented in chronological order, placed in their context, and accompanied with such remarks as show their relevance.

The synthesis handles interestingly all the important questions that pertain to the various aspects of St. Paul's idea, and to the combination of the primary and secondary elements of this great doctrine.

In the third part the author shows that the idea of social *body* is a Hellenic metaphor, while that of *head* is Semitic.

Professor Goossen's study is purely biblical theology. It will be a useful companion or introduction to such a work as Juergensmeier's *Mystical Body of Christ*, written for future priests and available since before the war in an English translation (Bruce).

W. LEONARD.

* * * *

In recent years the President of University College, Cork, issued a number of studies on different episodes in the Life of Christ. These studies made his readers eager for the complete Life of Christ, which he was known to be preparing. For these readers the present book [THE FAMILY AT BETHANY: Alfred O'Rahilly, M.A., D.Sc., D.Phil., D.Litt. 216 pp. 70 Illustrations. Cork University Press. Published Price 12/6] will be a disappointment—not for what it is, but for what it is not. Though Professor O'Rahilly has his material practically ready for the complete Life of our Lord he finds himself forced to issue this and one or two other preparatory volumes. He tells us frankly that the sale of this and some further Studies in the Life of Christ will determine whether he will complete his series of Studies and issue a complete Life. We are sure that readers of the present volume will do all they can to promote its sale so that we may have the benefit of what promises to be the best Life of Christ in the English language.

The particular episodes chosen for this volume centre round Lazarus, Martha and Mary. Necessarily there is an examination of the famous question of the 'Three Maries'. But more important is the study of the whole background of the events in which the members of the family appear. Such subjects as Jewish family life, Jewish burial customs, the topography of Jerusalem and its environs are woven into the narrative. There are two exegetical studies of real importance, one on the miracle of the raising of Lazarus, one on the Scripture accounts of the events of Easter morning. In addition there is an examination of the 'form-theory' in so far as it endeavours to identify

the historical Lazarus of Bethany with the Lazarus whom the parable describes as lying at Dives' gate.

What we have said may convey the impression that this book is another book of Apologetics. It is that—but much more. It is primarily a book for devotional use. It is the book of a scholar who has long contemplated the mysteries of the Life of Christ, but whose scientific habit of mind compels him to seek an accurate knowledge of what he is contemplating. Perhaps a description of the manner in which the book is written will make this plain. Each section begins with a translation of the passage of Scripture to be discussed. The translation is original and is followed by a series of notes explaining the exact shade of meaning to be attached to the Sacred text. These notes form one of the most scholarly parts of the book. Then comes the 'Study'. This is a development of the narrative, so ingeniously contrived that the exegesis of the passage is woven into the story without breaking the continuity, but rather providing the themes for meditation and prayer which are hidden behind the words of Scripture. Matter which could not well be introduced into the narrative is dealt with separately. Thus, after 50 pages of the 'Study' of the Raising of Lazarus follow six scholia on points of interest or controversy.

When the reader has reached the end of the book he might well turn back to the Introduction. He will be astonished to find that the author, with obvious sincerity, disclaims expert knowledge of Scripture and Theology. He writes as a layman who has been for many years a student of the Life of Christ but brings to his study the scientist's trained habit of mind in weighing evidence. In reality his equipment for writing the Life of Christ is—to put it modestly—not inferior to that of many scholars to whom this study is not a sideline but the main work of their lives. Those who are acquainted with Professor O'Rahilly's work in other fields know that he has a remarkable capacity for covering the literature of any subject in which he is interested. This capacity appears in every page of the present book. How a University administrator, professor of mathematical physics, economist, and much else besides, could have managed to cover the range of reading behind this book escapes the ordinary mind. He covers the whole literature, patristic, exegetical, linguistic, oriental. He is familiar with the writings of rationalists in most of the tongues of Europe. He discusses the fine shades of meaning of Hebrew and Aramaic words. He has covered also what art and archaeology have to offer on his theme

and the seventy illustrations are chosen with the definite purpose of elucidating the text. They range from the earliest Christian frescoes to a German wartime aerial photo of Jerusalem.

Needless to say, the Excursus on the problem of 'One or Three Maries' is as complete as can be expected in the dozen pages devoted to it. What Professor O'Rahilly calls a 'brief bibliography' runs to 20 volumes in English, French, German, Latin. In a matter so controverted it is possible that those familiar with Professor O'Rahilly's writings will look for some of that devastating irony and destructive criticism of which he is a master. But, on the contrary, he not only shows tolerance but pleads for tolerance and absence of heat in the discussion of a question to which, as yet, there is no prospect of a certain answer. His own conclusion is conservative. He says "These considerations show that it is still open to anyone—without having his intellectual integrity or exegetical competence impugned—to maintain that the Sinful Woman, Mary the sister of Martha and Mary the Magdalen are, in all probability, one and the same woman". This sanity of judgment and moderation of language marks the whole book: it is only when brought face to face with the breed of men who cover their hatred of things Christian with a false veneer of scholarship, that he loses his patience and speaks his mind with the directness of one who loves truth and hates shams.

Any criticisms we might offer would be on very trivial points of exegesis. Here and there are slips that should be attended to by proof-readers of the second edition. But most readers will be exasperated by the absence of Greek type. It is annoying to have to retransliterate English type into Greek. Obviously this defect is due to the need of cutting down the very high expense incurred in publishing such a book as this. But, so sure are we of its success, that we think Professor O'Rahilly may confidently drop a device which must have been repugnant to himself. We say we are sure of its success and we hope that everyone who appreciates a work that is suited to all Catholic readers and yet is not a mere work of vulgarisation, will do his best to promote its circulation.

W. KEANE, S.J.

*

*

*

*

In 1944 appeared the volume *Jésus en son temps*, written by the well known man of letters, Daniel-Rops. It formed part of the widely-known and read collection, *Les Grandes Etudes Historiques*, published

at Paris by Fayard. Highlights of the collection were the resounding *Napoleon* and *History of France* by the intelligent and alert Bainville, comrade of Maurras and member of the French Academy. Daniel-Rops' *Jésus* has now outdistanced in sales Bainville's *Napoleon*, Maurois' *History of England*, Louis Bertrand's *Louis XIV*, and Aubry's pathetic history of the *King of Rome*, Napoleon's son. Alone Bainville's *chef d'oeuvre*, the *History of France*, exceeds it. Of course, to measure a book's value by the extent of its sale is a frail criterion, but it is of interest to note that a well written and well informed History of Our Lord has an enormous appeal. Witness the enthusiasm aroused by Dorothy Sayers' radio plays on some incidents in Our Lord's life; witness also, but, of course, on a much higher plane, the extraordinary success of Mgr. Ricciotti's life of Christ in Italian, a work incidentally which attracted the attention of Mussolini during the last months of his stormy life.

But, written for the general reader, one can hear the severe critic exclaim! Guilty is the plea, with an appeal for mercy, because the scientific readers are so few, and the general readers are legion. From Daniel-Rops the general reader might be led to Lebreton, Prat, Lagrange and Mgr. Ricciotti; from them he will go to the text of the gospels, and provided he does not write a *Life of Christ* himself, he is no longer a general reader!

Daniel-Rops, after publishing his *Jésus*, wrote his view of the Old Testament *Le peuple de la Bible*, which runs third in the sales of Fayard's collection.¹ Now confess, general reader, that is something of a surprise. Once, general reader, we were in the stage when all was before us. We could have become scientific readers in the Old, or, New Testament, or, in both. We began the arid, distressing chapter of our preparation for life and fame with *Bible History*. Do you remember the old illustrations?: a king clinging for dear life to the bough of a tree, while the Flood waters gained on him inch by inch; the reconstruction of the ark; the Tower of Babel. These sections used to take up most of the time allowed for *Bible History* in the course of Apologetics. The following year, back to page one, and again the salutary contemplation of those vivid pictures. We became, the fault is ours, general readers, if any kind of readers at all, of the Old Testament. The New Testa-

¹Seemingly the volume on the Old Testament was written first, but the German authorities refused to allow it to be printed. Daniel-Rops, after concluding his Sacred History, has gone on to describe the history of the early Church.

ment was different. We had Fouard's *Life of Christ*, which told a story that could be grasped, and when the Gospels were turned to, our previous study made them gardens of delight in which we wandered, plucking modest flowers as became a modest general reader; gentle wild roses and boronia were our lot, the gorgeous highly coloured blooms, the rare and exotic, with those, naturally, the critics filled their baskets, far more than twelve, and yet returned for more. Why the fear of the Old Testament? Was it not because a path had not been cut for us through the teeming jungle of Old Testament traditions, poetry, mystical love poems, extraordinary happenings in the way of wives and concubines, terrible names, impossible places—history, tradition, poems, prayers, and prophecy in a veritable *tohu-wa-bohu*? Daniel-Rops proposes to rescue not only the French reader, but also the English reader. The English title of his book is *Israel and the Ancient World* (Translated by K. Madge, London, Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1949, Pp. 309, 16/-). Daniel-Rops begins his account with the call of Abram at Ur in the Lower Euphrates region: "This," he writes, "is the point of departure assigned in the Bible to the whole historical development of which the people of Israel was at once the agent and the witness". Four thousand years ago this small nomadic clan left Ur; they left Mesopotamia which had at least fifteen hundred years of history behind it, a lighthouse shining in the shadows of unformed barbarism. Only Egypt and the island of Crete (Australia will yet produce great Orientalists, as the finest blood of the Antipodes has enriched the storied fields of Gallipoli, Palestine, Syria, Greece, Egypt, and Crete) showed forth the lights of civilization. Sumerians, Aryans (Hittites, Karsites, Mitannians), Egyptians and other races fought and hacked their way to the empire of the world which then meant Mesopotamia and Egypt nurtured by the Nile, linked by Palestine—the Fertile Crescent, as Daniel-Rops calls it. How well it is described, although Daniel-Rops makes no claim of bringing fresh facts to light, he has the divine gift of enthusiasm bringing to life the ancient past and showing the story of this nomadic tribe against the tremendous world background. This is probably the book's main value, and it is one that will interest many readers. The Patriarchs each have their own individual characteristics, barring Isaac, whom the author finds insipid. With Joseph's surprising career in Egypt, Daniel-Rops finds himself very much at home.² Egypt—the gift

²Daniel-Rops dubs Joseph an Egyptian Disraeli, who, however, retained his ancestral religion.

of the river—and its wonderful history is excellently described. And so in God's time arose a leader of men, Moses, who led his people into the desert and prepared them for the conquest of the Promised Land. Moses, too, wrote down the traditions of the race, guarded jealously, of the creation of the world and of man, the Fall and the Flood. Under Josue, the battle of the Promised Land began. Jericho fell about the time Troy fell. Was the Promised Land so fertile? All is relative. To a man with his tongue hanging out coming in from the desert it was; but to a peasant from the Beauce or Medoc, Daniel-Rops feels it would not have appeared so rich. Then follows the period of the Judges and the gradual conquest of the country. Daniel-Rops is at his best with the royal period; Saul, David and Solomon (and his friend Hiram of Tyre) are sketched in a very lively fashion. Any feminine figures encountered get very special attention from the debonair author from the roguish smiling "Parisienne" of ancient Crete to the daughter of Pharaoh and Bethsabee.³ Briefly the author deals with the sad fate of the kingdom, its division, the fall of the Northern Kingdom, and finally the fall of Jerusalem (586 B.C.). After the exile the Jewish people lived amid the clash of the gigantic battles of Persians, Greeks, under Alexander the Great, and finally Pompey and the Romans, gradually forming the sects, manner of life and outlook that characterized the Jews at the time Our Saviour came into this sad world.

One cannot read this lively book without getting a much clearer idea of Jewish history. Also Daniel-Rops forces the reader to consult the Bible to see if its account tallies with his.

The French original has been criticized for several blunders. The English translator has included these, and, most unhappily contributed an abundant number of his own: Tagus for Taurus; Babylonian Rameses II, where "Babylonian" clearly belongs to the preceding sentence, which makes nonsense of the English version; the Israelites made their first *half* (halt) at Etham; five for fifteen, etc. These misunderstandings and misprints occur on almost every page, and indeed it is a shame that one leaves the English translation doubting almost every place-name and number. The French original has an imprimatur, which is lacking in the translation; the Authorized Version is used, for some strange reason, in the translation of a very Catholic book (surely

³The surprising fresco at Knossos of the head of a young girl, called the "Parisienne", is reproduced by G. Glotz, *The Aegean Civilization*, London, 1925, p. 66. The Cretan artist has anticipated Marie Laurencin.

Knox would have been an acceptable choice for all) ; the spelling of the place names in the text does not coincide with the spelling of the same names in the maps.

Yet, general reader, take up this book, most suitable in its warmth and enthusiasm for winter evenings, and it will create an interest that will lead you to deeper, more reliable and more scientific books on the Old Testament. Before you will realize it, you will have deserted the ranks of general readers, and can afford to despise Parisian fireworks.

The publishers promise us a translation of Daniel-Rops' *Life of Our Lord* to be known as *Jesus and His Times*. This very beautiful book deserves to receive a careful treatment by the translator—*Utinam!*

T. VEECH.

*

*

*

*

The barrier which has been erected between biological science and belief in God has been shaken a good deal over the years: but it remains one of the strongest bulwarks of atheism in scientific circles. Julian

BIOLOGY VERSUS

CATHOLIC PHILOSOPHY:

A NEW APPROACH.

Huxley, a great biologist and a representative figure, recently made the assertion that, among biologists, only "a handful of neo-Mendelian selectionists believe in the divine origin

of the universe".¹ Certainly, for the majority of competent contemporary biologists, their "mechanistic" biology goes hand in hand with a "non-theist" explanation of the universe. The "mechanistic" biology, it must be conceded, is not the product of materialistic prejudice. However much individual biologists may have been partisan and unscientific, fifty years of research and debate have produced a general theory of the origin and development of biological structures, which is accepted as their established basis of research by most biologists.

The very core of this theory is that all the properties of a living thing can ultimately be accounted for by the physical properties of its components, its structure, and its milieu. However, a small minority of biologists, the "vitalists", have attempted to show that in "life" there is an "irreducible factor", which cannot be explained merely in terms of forces known on the level of inanimate matter. Such an explanation is,

¹*Nature*, 163 (1949), p. 974, quoted in *Revue des Sciences philosophique et theologiques*, 33 (1949), p. 418, n. 49. Huxley continues that "probably not one would believe in the divine origin of the world of living things as they exist to-day, whether through special creation, or through a supernatural control of the process of evolution".

in their eyes, "materialistic" or "mechanistic", and, hence, to be rejected. In attempting to combat evolutionary monism, Catholics, and believing Christians generally, have given their patronage to the vitalistic theories, giving colour to the illusion that the "materialistic" theories are necessarily connected with a materialistic philosophy.

On to the stage thus prepared, there has entered an important and impressive figure. Fr. D. H. Salman, O.P., professor of Natural Philosophy at the Dominican House of Studies, Le Saulchoir, near Paris. Fr. Salman is well qualified for his role by his specialized knowledge both of the works of St. Thomas², and of current biology.³ In a recently-published article he has attempted an appraisal of "Recent Bio-philosophy" in the light of Thomistic philosophy. The interest and importance of his position lies in the fact that he wholeheartedly embraces the "mechanistic" or "materialistic" biology as the only one acceptable, from either the biological or the philosophical viewpoint. The weight of scientific opinion is there to support him on the one hand: on the other he appeals to history to show how it is that, in spite of the novelty of his position, he can lay claim to St. Thomas. In this note we shall attempt to summarise the conclusions he draws from a critique of some forty recent works, almost all of them published since the war, and to elaborate the philosophical bases of his position.

The article comprises three sections; an investigation into the historical causes of the opposition between "mechanistic" biology and Christian philosophy; a critical examination of current vitalistic theories; and an examination of recent "mechanistic" biology, together with a definition of its limits and a demonstration of its value.

I.—*The Historical Background.*

The ancient and medieval thinkers considered the universe as divided into two supreme categories: matter and spirit, matter including the whole quantified universe. From the sixteenth century onwards, however, the fundamental division was displaced by a great number of thinkers, so that the division of the universe came to be made primarily between "dead" matter and living things. This displacement was the

²He has produced an important study of the purpose of the "Summa Contra Gentiles", several studies of St. Thomas's usage of the latin translations of Aristotle, and of the Arab philosophers.

³His bulletins in the *Revue des Sciences philosophiques et theologiques* contain a continuous documentation and review of current international publications in the natural sciences such as no other Catholic philosophical review attempts to assemble. Over the past three years these bulletins total some 97 pages of extremely small print. They are remarkably complete in regard to American and British publications.

result of the reaction, common to Christians and deists, against the weakening of their natural theology by the new physics of Galileo and his successors. Galileo's principle of inertia stated that, once in motion, a body tended to remain in a state of motion without the intervention of any exterior force. Later, Newton's successors admitted that bodies attracted each other without the influence of an exterior force, and Laplace showed that this hypothesis accounted for the structure of the solar system.

Deprived of an adequate metaphysics, the apologists of those days had leant heavily on the physical proofs for the existence of God. They pointed to the necessity of a transcendent cause, a First Mover, to explain those movements which the ancient physics had found it convenient to assign to His causality. As the progress of physics led to a satisfying explanation of these movements by mundane forces, the "theodiscists" quietly abandoned the field and took refuge in a new stronghold. If it were true that the mechanical forces of matter might be explained by its intrinsic properties, at least "life" demanded a transcendent cause, God. This position was reinforced by the sentimentality of the romanticists, and later still by the philosophies of spontaneity, which endowed all life with a sort of moral value and even a rudimentary consciousness. The dignity of the human soul came to be linked up with the dignity and transcendence of life in general.

It is hardly necessary to remark that, since the Thomistic proofs of the existence of God are quite valid, even if every movement and property of material things can be explained by secondary forces. For those proofs depend on the very nature of motion, causality, contingency, participation and order as such, not on finding particular effects which must be ascribed to a transcendent cause. The anxiety to insist on the essential superiority of life over matter and to postulate that it cannot be explained adequately in terms of material forces was born from a vain illusion, and from a confusion of material with spiritual life.

II.—*Vitalistic Theories.*

The common procedure of the theorists of vitalism is to attempt to find some characteristic common to all "life" by which it is distinguished from "dead" matter. Usually they refuse to recognise that the properties they insist upon: unity, finality, autonomy, are characteristics which are found realised analogically in every degree of being, though in diverse modes in every single existent thing. Hence "autonomy" is a property of "life" only in a very indeterminate sense. For, on the one hand it is also a property of inert matter, and, on the other, no two

classes of living things are autonomous in any perfectly univocal sense of the word. It is grossly unscientific to take such leaps into the abstract without having examined the autonomy displayed by each of the various classes of living things, and sought its explanation in the combination of *all* the factors that enter into their composition and their *milieu*.

Vitalistic theories may be classified in three principal categories: those that radically oppose "matter" and "life"; those that tend to pan-psychism; those that invoke a special intervention of God to explain life.

The first of these tendencies posits a radical opposition between living things and matter as a primordial fact, which does not admit of explanation. This opposition is based on some such characteristic as "unity", or "directness", or "autonomy". No attempt is made to make an exhaustive investigation either of the complexity of the organism in relation to its *milieu*, or of the possibilities which inert matter offers in combination.

Other scientists, such as Professor Lillie, having examined more closely the relations of biological phenomena to the structure and biochemistry of the beings concerned, have been forced to look elsewhere for a site in which to lodge the quasi-human characteristics of "life". Hence they flee to the last remaining unexplored realm: that of infra-atomic structures. By a series of gratuitous hypotheses and unjustified comparisons psychological liberty is explained by infra-atomic indeterminism. The result is an acknowledged pan-psychism, which having begun by exaggerating the separation between "life" and matter, ends by suppressing matter altogether.

The third tendency, represented most ably by Professor Bounoure, accepting the proposition that "life" and matter demand radically different kinds of explanation, and realising the unsatisfactory character both of pan-psychism and of theories that place an opposition between life and matter without attempting to explain it, takes refuge in the action of God. This tendency is reinforced by the number of Catholic philosophers who so insist on the essential superiority of living matter over inert matter, that they postulate a special influence of God at the origin of life as a matter of metaphysical necessity. The bio-philosophers who follow this tendency usually arrive at a conception of the soul as an "incarnate" idea, or "principle of life" which is far removed from the genuine Thomistic notion of a substantial form, wholly correlative to and immersed in the potencies of its matter. We must beware, too, of the natural inclination to consider God as being placed on the same plane as mundane forces and acting among them, supplying certain effects

that they do not supply. God is the First Cause, acting outside the order of secondary causes, applying them to action, and only intervening among them in the case of miracles.

There is every reason to believe that, just as the properties of a compound are reducible to the properties of their component elements plus their chemical organization, so the properties of living things may be reduced to the properties of their elements, plus their organic structure. For in both cases there is question of a material substantial form, which is determined by the ultimate dispositions which precede its eduction from matter. Hence the fundamental assumption of vitalism is gratuitous, from both a scientific and a philosophical point of view.

III.—*Materialistic Biology.*

The vitalist positions are bolstered by a method which insists too strongly on morphological and paleontological considerations, to the neglect of the essential considerations of bio-chemistry and cytology. Recent discoveries⁴ have enabled de Beer and Florkin to develop a complete classification of animal groups by bio-chemical properties, which is completely independent of morphological considerations.

The advance of bio-chemistry makes clear the fallacy of the vitalist objections that the world of living things could not have been constituted by hazard, or that life could not come from "dead" matter. For in every change there is at work, not just a few isolated agents, but the totality of the universe, which is an organised complexus of innumerable forces, all guided by a definite finality. There is no question of "hazard", nor of "the greater arising from the less", for the totality of the universe is undoubtedly superior to any of its parts. To postulate "omne vivum ex vivo" as a matter of metaphysical necessity is to consider only individual agents, neglecting the highly organized structure and dynamism of the universe as revealed to us by modern chemistry.

Such a "materialist" conception takes nothing away from the transcendent action of God. Nor does it necessarily deny that God could have interfered here or there in the process of evolution. The question of fact will continue to be the preserve of paleontologists, exegetes and theologians.

Father Salman's approach to the "new learning" of Biology bids fair to achieve a reconciliation with Catholic philosophy analogous to that achieved by St. Thomas between theology and the "new learning" of his day. If that be so, it is not to be hoped that he will be any more immune from misunderstanding and mistrust than was his master.

JOHN BURNHEIM.

⁴Summarised by M. Florkin, *L'Evolution Biochimique*, Liège, Desoer, 1944, 210 pp. Cf. D. H. Salman, loc. cit., vol. 31, p. III.

Book Reviews

LETTERS AND SHORTER WORKS OF ST. JOHN EUDES
(New York: Kennedy). 338 pp.

To students of French history one of the most interesting aspects of French religious life is its impact on what we might call, secular power. This is particularly true when the 17th century is under review, for *le grand monarque* with all his worldliness and earthiness was the monarch of Catholic France who owed much of her glory to her saints. Even St. John Eudes, humble and detached though he was, felt honoured when a ray from *le roi soleil* shone across his path. It was doubly welcome after the chill of the king's displeasure as conveyed to the saint by Colbert. There surely was never such a figure of glorified worldliness as Louis XIV. He could be gracious and charming, too, as we read in the letter St. John Eudes wrote the day after his auspicious audience:

"Yesterday I had the honour of seeing the King at St. Germain. It happened in this way: I was ushered into the King's room, where I found myself surrounded by a large group of bishops, priests, dukes. . . . His Lordship of Paris took me to one corner of the room. When the King made his entrance, he walked by all these great lords and came directly up to me, his expression full of kindness. Then I began to speak to him of our affair and he listened most attentively. . . . He said to me: 'I am very pleased to see you. I have heard about you. I feel quite sure that you are doing a great deal of good in my States. . . .'" That was the only meeting of the Saint with his monarch, for St. John Eudes died the following year at the age of seventy-nine.

Well might Louis XIV have heard of him, the founder of three Religious Congregations, the reformer of the clergy, the preacher of missions. Yet all that John Eudes had set out to do was to make Our Lord and our Lady loved in his beloved Normandy. He holds a special place in the history of the Church as the priest who first established devotion to the Sacred Heart and to the most Holy Heart of Mary. In Australia our chief link with him is through the Good Shepherd Nuns who honour him as their founder. The Congregation of Jesus and Mary which he also founded is better known as the Eudist Fathers. They do fine missionary work in Europe, U.S.A., and Canada, and deserve our special thanks for this first English translation of their founder's letters. Their present Superior-General is a cousin of St. Thérèse of Lisieux. In his Introduction to this volume he writes:

"The letters of St. John Eudes should not be read superficially or in haste. They are spiritual reading, rather heavy, perhaps, but rich in spiritual thought like the Norman soil from which they are sprung".

Whether the letters are long or short, of suffering or of rejoicing, the great-hearted saint shows himself a devoted lover of Our Lord. From a town where he and some other Fathers are conducting a mission he writes in his seventieth year:

"God has given me so much strength on this mission that I have preached almost every day for twelve weeks to an enormous audience in the cathedral, with as much vigour as I had at the age of thirty. That is why I have resolved to spend the rest of my life in this work. . . ."

Three years later, while he was still immersed in difficulties regarding the approbation of the Congregation he had founded, he writes in words that have the authentic ring of sanctity:

"I always implore God in His goodness to destroy our little Congregation completely if it does not exist for His greatest glory, and I embrace with my whole heart all the mortifications and humiliations which would consequently be mine. . . ."

We like to think that *le grand monarque*, that day in his throne room, was touched by the aura of holiness which must have surrounded the humble, old saint. How very out of place he must have seemed in the hard eyes of the court sycophants. Yet some fineness in Louis XIV bridged all incongruity as he paid tribute to a Christ-like subject, saying (who knows with what inward wistfulness):

"I shall be very pleased to see you again".

M.O.

*

*

*

*

PRAELECTIONES BIBLICAE, Simon-Prado, C.SS.R. Novum Testamentum, II. Marietti, Turin and Rome, 1948 (Editio sexta retractata), XVIII + 528 pp.

This well known book, which first appeared in 1922, deals with the Acts of the Apostles, the Pauline Epistles, and the Catholic Epistles. Fr. Prado has respected the text of the master so well, that there is little difference between the early editions and this late one. Fr. Prado has brought the bibliography up to date, and changed the appearance of the pages of the book, by the use of bold type to bring to the eye at once important arguments. The early editions were welcomed in the

A.C.R.; the book has become well known; the frequent editions show that there is a steady demand for this scholarly book, which is, probably, the best in its field.

T.V.

*

*

*

*

THE ETERNAL PRIESTHOOD, by Cardinal Manning. London, Burns Oates, 1950. 8/6. 286 pp.

The London Catholic publishers, Burns Oates, are to be congratulated on bringing out a new (the 25th) edition of Cardinal Manning's famous work. Lytton Strachey in the twenties had great sport among the Victorian worthies, ending his account of Manning's life with a snapshot of the Hat hanging in forlorn state at Westminster. One wonders if Strachey had read *The Eternal Priesthood*, because this book reveals the sane, solid sacerdotal piety of Manning. *The Eternal Priesthood* is a book which many would have preferred Cardinal Newman to have written; but just as Manning played a decisive role at the Vatican Council, so also, the glory of *The Eternal Priesthood* belongs to him. After twenty-five editions, the old chapters are as fresh and moving as the day they were written. Based on the great principles, the book has hardly aged. Many priests will be glad to read again the telling chapters; such as, *The Obligation to Sanctity in the Priesthood*, *The End of the Priest*, *The Priest's Helps*, and *The Priest's Sorrows*. *The Eternal Priesthood* is an excellent meditation book. Somehow it recalls the holy atmosphere of our early retreats, and it is a most useful mirror to see outlined the true Priest, and it leads us to consider our own priestly lives by that model. The price, even in Australia, should be moderate. That is something Manning would have liked, as the book is too important to be costly.

T.V.

*

*

*

*

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. Trans. Ronald Knox. London, 1949. Burns Oates. Price, 6d.

After having published the four Gospels, translated by Mgr. Knox, in a very cheap and pocket size edition, now is the turn of the *Acts of the Apostles*. The print is good, and the handy size should appeal to many, and the book would be most suitable to be used in the schools.

T.V.

SAINT FRANCIS OF ASSISI—The Legends and Lauds. Edited by Otto Karrer. (Sheed & Ward). 300 pp.

At the sight of a big book (translated from German) on St. Francis, it must be admitted that a mood of protest envelops a reviewer who inwardly murmurs: "If I want to read St. Francis I can go to Jørgensen's masterpiece". Still protesting, the reviewer walks cautiously round Otto Karrer's book. Then, as an entrance must be made some time and some where, it is made by the back door. Petulance changes to respect: Here is no dilettante. Over twenty pages of notes testify to an admirer who has *worked* in exhaustive, and probably exhausting, research. So, round to the front with respectful alacrity. A second glance at the title shows that the author has gathered together the chief sources of all the reputable books that have ever been written about St. Francis. The legends left by the contemporaries of the saint are introduced in an explanation by the editor, who states in his general preface: "The Franciscan legends were written to a great extent by true poets... but they are records of facts that really happened and in most cases can be dated and placed".

The book is divided into sections under the titles: Giovanni di Ceprano, Thomas of Celano, The Writings of Brother Leo and his Companions, St. Bonaventure, Fioretti, Laude, The Testament. In the short introduction to each section we realise the scholarship that has gone to the making of this book. Before the Ceprano legend we read: "My translation has been made from the Latin original".

As we read Ceprano's account of the saint we fall again under the Franciscan spell that is a reflection of the spell of the Gospel. Ceprano remarks (and he speaks of life, in, what sounds to us, a world as tired and old as our own, though seven hundred years younger—tired and old with the decay of sin)—Ceprano remarks: "At that time the love and fear of God had died out all over the country; no man knew the way of contrition, which was held to be mere foolishness. The temptations of the flesh, the cupidity of the world and the pride of life had grown so strong that one could have thought that the whole world was subjected to these three evil forces". Writing of Francis and his companions Ceprano tells us that "charity flamed so brightly in their hearts that it seemed easy to them to risk their lives, not only for the love of Christ, but also for the spiritual and corporal welfare of their brethren... Those among them who were distinguished by a position of authority or by some special gift behaved with even greater humility than the others..."

Francis, thou shouldst be living at this hour. The world has need of thee.

Even in translation, the pages of Thomas of Celano carry us along many a lovely mile of the saint's life, for he was a writer of distinction, renowned, if for nothing else, as the author of the *Dies Irae*. It is Celano who gives us most clearly the saint's gospel of joy: "The devil exults most of all when he can deprive a servant of God of the gladness of his spirit. . . . Should, as may happen, a servant of God be somewhat troubled in his spirit for one reason or another, he must arise and pray. And he should persist in the presence of his heavenly Father until He has given him back his salutary joy. . . ." St. Francis has laid his spell on us again.

There is nothing now to be done but to read the whole book, taking away with us a spark from the glowing spirit who gave us the Canticle of the Sun, that ends, as it were, with the saint on his knees:

Praise and bless my Lord, render thanks to Him
And serve Him with great humility.

M.O.

* * * *

WE LIVE WITH OUR EYES OPEN. Dom Hubert van Zeller.
London. Sheed and Ward. 7/6.

This collection of thirty-nine miscellaneous essays follows the manner of the author's previous book, *We Die Standing Up*, and repeats both the merits and the defects of that work. No doubt the varied array of subjects leads to greater interest for the reader, but it is to be feared that a dispersion of air leads to a weakening of effectiveness. The reader can hardly help feeling that some shots, far from being aimed at a new target, are fired completely at random.

The essays contain various hints for people in various walks of life, and the readers are encouraged to put these hints into practice, which is as it should be. Often the author's own reflections and his development of his subject is far more clear and pointed than the story by which he seeks to illustrate his point; this is particularly the case in the fifth essay, More about Creatures. The essay on Integrity, though very short, touches upon some of the most important matter dealt with in the book, and might well have been developed along with the essay on Truth.

The tribute to Father Bede Jarrett is a warm manifestation of sin-

cere and personal affection and respect. The hints on prayer seem to follow the model of Abbot Chapman, but do not attain the lucidity of the model.

In the essay on Integrity this sentence occurs: "We can only be ourselves when we are being *alteri Christi*". Apart from the violence done to the Latin *alter* in so using it in the plural, surely the concept also is at variance with the theme of unity so often hinted at in this book; and it would hardly meet with the approval of St. Paul, who wrote of: "the building up of the body of Christ, till we attain to the unity of the faith and of the full knowledge of the Son of God, to the perfect man, to the full measure of the stature of Christ". There is no plurality here.

J.S.K.

*

*

*

*

THE ADMIRABLE HEART OF MARY, by St. John Eudes (New York: Kennedy). 362 pp.

When the Eudist Fathers in Canada decided to commemorate the tercentenary of their Congregation, they became the benefactors of Christians in English-speaking lands, for they then produced, in 1943, the first English translation of the collected works of St. John Eudes.

It is a particularly happy arrangement of Divine Providence that in this era when we are being led to more fervent devotion to the Immaculate Heart of Mary, we should be given the book which St. John Eudes considered almost as his life's work: *The Admirable Heart of Mary*. It is the fruit of over twenty years of prayer and study, and was finished only three weeks before his death in 1680, nearly three hundred years ago. Yet this present era, in its great need, is the hour appointed by God, that the hearts of Catholics may be enkindled by the words of St. John Eudes. How strange it is that this book is the first complete work ever to be published on the devotion to the Immaculate Heart of Mary. His own countrymen became acquainted with his writings only about forty years ago. The seed went underground for a long time. But the good God wastes nothing.

This is a book that should be in every spiritual library. It is not just another book about Our Lady, but a clear exposition of the foundations of our devotion to the Immaculate Heart of Mary. If one were asked just why the book is so satisfying, three points come to mind:

1. It is, as it were, a fresh interpretation of the Universe. The sections that comprise the Symbolic Pictures: Mary's heart compared to the Sun and other glories of Nature. After reading these sec-

tions, all Nature has over it a more tender radiance, and verses of the Scriptures yield new meanings, e.g., "He has set his tabernacle in the Sun".

2. The whole book is so richly scriptural that it is a perpetual feast. And how much our recitation of Office feels the need of a fresh breeze! We go back to it seeing in it new beauties, because of our good guide, St. John Eudes.
3. He has read so deeply the writings of the early Fathers of the Church and of all the great saints that we are continually being delighted by passages hitherto unknown to us. (A poor wight speaks.)
4. Lastly (and many will think this its strongest attraction) the whole trend of St. John Eudes' devotion to our Lady is turned to its ultimate goal: adoration of the Most Holy Trinity.

Although his prose style (well preserved, it would seem, in translation) is marked by logical precision, there is a lyrical quality about this particular book of St. John Eudes. We feel he would have loved the poetic tribute paid to our Lady by Gerard Manley Hopkins, with its touching appeal:

Be thou then, O thou dear
Mother, my atmosphere;
My happier world, wherein
To wend and meet no sin.

One of St. John Eudes' many tributes to his Sovereign Lady is a kindred theme: "The Heart of our Holy Mother is truly a heaven, an empyrean heaven, the Heaven of Heaven. . . . O Heaven, in which divine mercy has established its throne and deposited its treasures, where it hearkens to the cry of the unfortunate and helps them in all their necessities! 'O Lord, thy mercy is in heaven'."

To return to the central theme of St. John Eudes' book on our Lady—adoration of the Blessed Trinity. Many will think that this is its most insistent message. Certainly, one of the deep needs not only of our own souls but of the world, is an increase of the spirit of adoration. O the richness and fullness of a life that adores for "those who do not adore"! Would that we might often gather our scattered sense, as we go our way, saying with St. John Eudes in the depths of our heart:

O sacrosancta Trinitas,
Aeterna vita cordium,
Cordis Mariae sanctitas,
In corde regnes omnium.

NOW WELCOME SUMMER. By Francis Herlihy, Dublin: Clonmore and Reynolds. Price, 8s. 6d.

In what must be the most fascinating book of its kind ever written, Father Herlihy arouses and satisfies our curiosity about many aspects of the foreign missions by taking us with him on an exciting and excellently conducted tour of those parts of the Far East with which his work as a missionary during the war has made him familiar.

On a blazing afternoon of January, 1940, we move slowly out of Sydney Harbour on board the crowded Taiping, and the first notable port of call is Manilla. This visit to the Phillipines is made forever memorable not so much by our guide's learned disquisition on the rise and fall, and gradual rise again, of Catholicism in those regions as by two delightful days spent in the company of those Columban priests whose subsequent martyrdom at the hands of the Japanese so profoundly stirred the Christian world.

After Manilla, Hong Kong and Shanghai, with their teeming international populations, present tempting fields for exploration, but there is time only for a short visit to the far-famed Jesuit Mission at Zi-ka-wei, and to the convent of Sancta Sophia, where Australian and Irish Sisters care for two hundred Russian Catholic girls and accustom themselves to the, at first, disconcerting experience of being unable to assist at Mass except in the unfamiliar Byzantine rite.

Korea, our final destination, is reached after some weeks of unforgettable experiences. There we are deeply moved by the heroic labours of Monsignor Quinlan and his little band of priests to establish the Church in the midst of difficulties increased a hundredfold by the outbreak of war and the consequent suspicion and dislike on the part of the Japanese authorities of all foreigners. Previous to his appointment as Prefect Apostolic of Korea, the Monsignor had spent many years in China. Two incidents of that period, with which he was intimately concerned, are graphically described: the heroic martyrdom of Fathers Leonard and Tierney, and the great flood of 1931, when the Yangtse rose fifty-three feet above its normal level, and a hundred and eighty million people were either drowned or rendered destitute.

Finally, after some experiences of Japanese protection in a squalid prison camp, a journey to Japan itself, and a unique account of war conditions in that country, we come to the end of our tour, and our book, with feelings of genuine regret.

Nobody at all interested in the work of the missions should fail to read this delightfully written book.

R.W.

THE DIVINE CRUCIBLE, by Mother Mary of St. Austin. (Burns Oates). 182 pp.

Under this heading have been gathered the thoughtful papers of a Mistress of Novices, a member of the Congregation in England known as *Helpers of the Holy Souls*. After her death, Rev. Nicholas Ryan, S.J., carefully revised and edited her writings, thus giving us a valuable and unusual book. Its author speaks of its contents as "musings or meditations on Purgatory". Happily the description is not quite accurate. Two parallel lines of thought run through the book: the purification of the souls in Purgatory and the work that suffering does for us in this life. She quotes Fr. Rickaby, S.J., in his preface to the Life of St. Margaret Mary: "The mystic has his Purgatory here. Few souls are brave enough to endure that...". Mother St. Austin, in her writings, seems to have had in mind Our Lord's words to St. Margaret Mary as He showed her His Sacred Heart: "This is the divine Purgatory of My Love in which you must be purified; I will afterwards make you find in it an abode of light, and finally of union and transformation".

We do not need to be thinking about the mystery of Purgatory to be deeply moved by countless passages in this book. In the chapter entitled "Cleansed by the Attributes of God", we read: "Only when the Sacred Image has penetrated the very depths of the passive soul will the soul be capable of entering into the height of Christ's glory. The knowledge of God and of His attributes only comes to us through the Crucified, and through the purgatorial silences which His Passion makes in the soul". The author returns often to the positive and cleansing power of silence even in this life. (It must be because of its power in building a serene personality, that the enemy of all good is arranging that there is less and less of it among our distracted fellow-men.)

Throughout this book you feel that the writer has been away on the far, clear hills of prayer, and has come back to give us a terse résumé of the wonders she has seen. Perhaps that is the best way to write about these wonders: "The possession of God is the silence of the heart. The thought of God is the silence of the mind. For silence is not an emptiness but a plenitude; it is not the cessation of thought but the fullness of activity... The wounds of Christ are the gates of God's silences. For all souls—both in this world and in the next—these wounds are the portals by which go in and out the sources of life ever more abundantly..."

As for the verses that appear occasionally through the book, many

people will agree that they could have been spared. Not all mystics have the poetic gift of St. John of the Cross. The things Mother St. Austin has to say are so noble that their very saying has, in prose, a dignity more appealing than any ornament verse might provide. Take at random the paragraph: "The purified soul, separated from all but the Divine Purity, has then no impulse but the love of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost; has no will but Theirs. She lives in their society; their Being is the source of her own..."

We recommend this book to anyone feeling the need of a holiday from training that poor recalcitrant soul. It is good for us to escape at times to the hills of adoration where God says to the spirit: "Be still, and see that I am God!"

M.O.

*

*

*

*

LIFE OF DEAN O'BRIEN, Founder of the C.Y.M.S. By M. J. Egan. Dublin, M. H. Gill and Son Ltd. Price, 4/6.

In August, 1878, the Young Men's Societies of Great Britain presented an address to Cardinal Newman, congratulating His Eminence on his appointment as a Prince of the Church. In the course of his reply the Cardinal paid this remarkable tribute to Dean O'Brien: "I am glad to recognize with you the similarity of aims which exists in the work of our glorious Saint (Philip Neri), who lived three centuries ago in Italy, and that of the excellent priest who has been in this century and in these Islands the founder of the Young Men's Societies". To paint, after the lapse of more than sixty years, the portrait of this "excellent priest", this modern Philip Neri, against the sombre background of the troubled period in which he lived, has obviously not been an easy task, but his characteristic industry and patient research has enabled Mr. Egan to overcome many difficulties and to produce a picture of the Dean that will be eagerly welcomed and appreciated.

Except as Founder of the C.Y.M.S., which is his chief and most enduring title to fame, we knew all too little about this remarkable priest, his character, his zeal, his many-sided genius. It was not generally known, for example, that for six years after his ordination in 1839 he had charge of the diocesan college in Nova Scotia; that after his return to Ireland he accepted a professorship at All Hallows from the saintly Father Hand, whose class-fellow he had been at Maynooth;

that after some years on the mission in his native Limerick he did a post graduate course in Rome and obtained his Doctorate of Divinity; and that once again he resumed his professorship at All Hallows before finally settling down as parish priest of Kilfinane and Newcastle West. The years at All Hallows he always considered the happiest of his life, and in his old age he often expressed a doubt as to the wisdom of having exchanged his position of professor for that of a parish priest. A gifted lecturer and preacher as well as the author of at least three historical novels, it is no exaggeration to say that few ecclesiastics of his time were better or more widely known, and the surprising thing is that he has had to wait so long for his first biographer.

R.W.

* * * *

RELIGION AND THE RISE OF WESTERN CULTURE, by Christopher Dawson (The Gifford Lectures of 1948). Sheed and Ward, London, 1950. xvi + 283 pages, 18/-.

The highly specialized process which the scientific study of historical Christianity has made necessary, has unfortunately tended to divide our view of Western civilization; we have a number of highly developed, autonomous fields of study, such as political history, social, economic and constitutional history, on the one hand, and on the other, ecclesiastical history embracing the history of the Church as a world organization, the history of dogma and liturgiology, with however, little or no effort to study "the intricate and far-reaching network of relations that unite the social way of life with spiritual beliefs and values, . . . the creative interaction of religion and culture in the life of Western society". To bridge this gap, Christopher Dawson has devoted all the powers of his far-seeing and deeply-penetrating mind. Religion as "the dynamic element in culture", is the key to the long series of Dawson's books, of which the present volume is the climax, being, as he says, a study "of our own way of life and the way of life of our ancestors, not merely by documents and monuments, but from our personal experience". It is not a defence of his fundamental thesis on the inter-relation of religion and culture; this is pre-supposed from his earlier works. It is rather an illustration of how, in point of fact, his thesis has come nearest to fulfilment in the mediaeval synthesis of religion and life.

Dawson's thought can be best grasped in the light of material and formal causality. The barbarian warrior-society, which crashed in on

the already crumbling Roman Empire, the Northmen, who plunged Europe into the Second Dark Age, and later, Greek and Oriental influences, these form the material which the Church set herself to transform, to penetrate and integrate with the Graeco-Roman tradition which she preserved, made her own and developed through her various organs and creations in every age, through the liturgy and monasticism, the Carolingian Empire, her missionaries, the papacy and the preaching orders of friars.

Unfortunately the central chapters are not as decisive as one would desire; this is due, no doubt, to the difficulty in tracing with any degree of certainty the complicated cultural movements of the Dark Ages; however, the chapters devoted to the high culture of the Middle Ages depict with remarkable clarity and insight the corporate life of the mediaeval commune and university which arose out of the universal, spiritual organization of human knowledge and social-economic life. It is this, and more particularly the skilful pages devoted to the ethical and sociological principles of Aristotle, and their assimilation into the structure of Christian thought that will appeal to the student of social science.

The scientific historian will be attracted by the mass of historical detail, the placing of so many historical figures in their right perspective with due appreciation of the particular contribution of each to the common culture of Western Europe; men like Humbert of Moyenmoutier, Nicolas of Cusa, Aegidius Romanus, Wazo of Liege, St. Olaf, Theodore of Tarsus, to mention but a few amongst the hundreds of others—as the comprehensive index displays—to whom in a greater or lesser degree we owe the preservation of our civilization. But it is from the students of the philosophy of history, and from all who are anxious to interpret the events of our time that the book calls forth the greatest response; for it is a study of the intimate nature and component elements of our culture, a study which reveals that the vital element, the regenerating organ of our bankrupt, errant society, in this present crisis as in every other, is the Christian religion.

Included in the volume are several beautiful illustrations of mediaeval Christian art, which are accompanied by helpful explanatory notes.

J.R.C.

BOOKS of INTEREST

For the Parish
For the Reader
For Gifts

MONSIGNOR KNOX. Translation of the Bible. Vol. 1. Genesis-Esther. Now ready, 30/-. Vol. II in preparation, to be ready 1950.

ON ENGLISHING THE BIBLE. Essays on Translation in general and the Bible in particular 8/6

EUCCHARISTIC HOURS, by Most Rev. R. Ryan, D.D., C.M. Revised edition of this most complete Holy Hour Book 15/6

RITUALE ROMANUM. Editio juxta typicam. Descbee. Lournar, 1947. 18 mo. Leather, gilt edges 46/6

WINDOW IN MAYNOOTH. Potted history, as well as guide book. Denis Meehan induces Maynooth to tell its own history 17/6

FATHER BROWN STORIES. An omnibus volume of 48 G. K. Chesterton stories 17/6

PAROCHIAL.

MASS INTENTION BOOK, 7½ins. x 5ins., Full Cloth 5/6

REGISTER OF SICK CALLS, 10ins. x 7½ins., Approved 5/6

Pellegrini & Co.

PTY. LTD.

543 GEORGE ST., SYDNEY. M 4171.

AND IN ALL AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL CITIES.